DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 755 SP 010 809

AUTHOR	Metheny, Eleanor
TITLE	Vital Issues.
INSTITUTION	American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	180p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AAHPER Publications-Sales, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($9.95)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Development; *Health Education; *Historical Reviews; Humanistic Education; *Physical Education; Physical Fitness; *Speeches; Womens Athletics; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*Metheny (Eleanor)

ABSTRACT

This publication contains nineteen speeches delivered over a thirty-year period of involvement by the author in health, physical education, and recreation activities. Grouped under time-related headings, the speeches deal with: (1) "Active Bodies," two speeches (1942, 51) reflecting a World War II and Korean War concern with a healthy, prepared citizenry; (2) "Perceptive Minds" and "Sport and Dance," a group of ten speeches (1950-71) with a "whole person" viewpoint, concerned with affective, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, symbolic and "meaningful" aspects of physical education; (3) six speeches delivered between 1950 and 1959 dealing with women's liberation, professional progress, and change dynamics, grouped into "Women in Action" and "Propositions." The concluding speech, "People Make Ideas Happen" (1970) reviews the history of American physical education. (MB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135755

VITAL ISSUES

Eleanor Metheny

Professor Emeritus of Physical Education • University of Southern California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHPER

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP010 809

AMERICAN ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

2

COPYRIGHT © 1977

AMERICAN ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH,
PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publisher. For information, address the Alliance, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Order from:
AAHPER Publications-Sales,
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20036

Contents

5 **Foreword**

7 **Preface**

I ACTIVE BODIES
11 Are Sports Enough? (1942)
21 This Is Where We Came In (1951)

II PERCEPTIVE MINDS
28 Relaxation and Kinesthesis (1950)
38 The Third Dimension (1954)
42 The Intricate Web (1958)
53 This Is Physical Education (1965)
61 Learning and Moving (1971)

III SPORT AND DANCE
70 Competition and Education (1957)
77 Will We Save Our Tennis Courts? (1958)
85 Sport and the Feminine Image (1964)
98 The Excellence of Patroclus (1968)
103 Dancers Create . . . (1971)

IV WOMEN IN ACTION
110 I Like Being a Teacher (1950)
119 Female Folklore, Fiction, and Fantasy (1958)
131 The Story of DGWS: 1892-1958 (1958)
151 The "Woman's Look" in Sport (1959)

V PROPOSITIONS
162 The Conservative-Liberal Debate (1962)
167 Dynamics of Change (1969)
173 People Make Ideas Happen (1970)

Foreword

Some among us are destined to be catalysts for change. Such a person is Eleanor Metheny. Never content to analyze without seeking germinal roots, never satisfied to deduce without suggesting probable outcomes, she is a well-spring of understanding from whence flows both the knowledge to sponsor change and the energy to effect change.

Educated as a mathematician, Eleanor Metheny's scholarship brought to physical education meticulous attention to logic. Socialized as an artist, Eleanor Metheny's creativity brought to physical education a flair and verve for discerning shadowy projections which were extensions of reality. Through her persistent probing, the core of physical education knowledge was exposed as the process of movement and the pattern of play in addition to the established concept of fitness and the understandings of the acquisition of skill.

Always articulate, never hesitating to make us reach beyond our grasp, profound and compelling as a speaker even as she is compassionate and warm as a friend, this woman has made each of us better than we might have been without her presence.

The wisdom of this leader as she speaks out on vital issues continues to be an underlying foundation of our professional endeavors. Foremost among our provocators, she is vital because she offers alternatives, and thus tantalizes us to change.

As the Alliance publishes this edition of her major themes, we acknowledge our debt to Eleanor Metheny, our honored and respected colleague, our catalyst for change. She is the person in our midst whose professional contributions have discerned vital issues for our growth.

Celeste Ulrich
President, 1976-77
American Alliance for Health,
Physical Education, and Recreation

Preface

This divers lot of speeches ranges through 30 eventful years of human history, 1942-71. It also spans the complexities of countless professional meetings, an ever-changing array of more-or-less vital issues, and two incompatible philosophical systems, each represented by a host of major variants. However, "issues" tend to change with "time"—and so do professional "philosophies." So some of the complexities can be sorted out by grouping the speeches under time-related headings.

Thus, during the years of World War II and the Korean War we were largely concerned with "active bodies"—within the context of prevailing variants of mind-body dualism, as represented by an eclectic mish-mash of idealism, realism, and pragmatism.

By 1950, we were trying to reconcile the assumptions of mind-body dualism with a vaguely defined conception of "the whole person." And personally I was beginning to explore the writings of various existential and humanistic philosophers. So from then on, my speeches reflected my continuing interest in "the whole person"—with particular reference to affective, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, symbolic, and "meaningful" aspects of experiences related to physical education. Ten of those speeches, 1950-71, are grouped under two headings: "Perceptive Minds" and "Sport and Dance." Others in the same vein were not available for this collection because of recent inclusion in another collection called *Moving and Knowing* (Peek Publications, 1975).

Along the way I was also involved in other causes, such as women's lib and professional progress. So you will find four speeches under "Women in Action," 1950-59, and three under the heading "Propositions," 1962-70. The propositional speech for 1970, "People Make Ideas Happen," reviews the entire history of American physical education. It also provides a good introduction to my ways of thinking about the importance of continuous controversy within the profession. I hope you will read it first.

Beyond this, the speeches may be read in any order, preferably with reference to the date and occasion of initial presentation, as shown on the title page of each. However, if you choose to read them in chronological order, you may notice that later speeches do not necessarily agree with earlier ones and that at times I may seem to be disagreeing with myself as well as with my professional ancestors. I think this is how it should be, so I have made no attempt to harmonize earlier and later speeches. Rather, I have let each speech stand as written in its own moment of history.

In their own time, many of my speeches expressed a minority point of view. They were often deemed "controversial" and "provocative" by colleagues who honestly believed that the human intellect can not participate in motorized activities. Now, younger members of the Alliance may find my attempts to "intellectualize" physical education somewhat less controversial, possibly wholly unprovocative, and probably downright "old-fashioned"—because some of my interpretations have now been outmoded by new developments in philosophy, physiology, psychology, and other areas. But I hope they will still be disposed to sample some of these outmoded speeches, if only in the interests of historical understanding.

I want to thank my own contemporaries for the privilege of exploring my own ways of thinking on many platforms and in many professional meetings. Thanks to your generosity and forbearance, I have known the hazards, the hopes, and the joy of trying to make my own ideas happen in my own profession. Truly, this has been a joyous experience, for which I am deeply grateful.

I

Active Bodies

Are Sports Enough? (1942)

At this conference we have raised the question, Can we maintain our democractic procedures in physical education while preparing boys and girls for a wartime society? Such a question suggests, first, that the War has had or should have some effect on our program; secondly, it raises a question as to the efficacy of our peacetime program in preparing youth for a global war.

Our physical education program has never been single-minded. We have always had a number of objectives, the most common ones being briefly described as health, skills, education, recreation, democratic living, and character training. The general public has never completely understood the multiple-objective nature of our program. Now that war is upon us, it is perhaps understandable that the general public is not asking, How well are you educating the whole child? How well are you teaching skills for satisfaction and recreation? How well are you instilling the principles of democratic living? How much are you doing in molding character? The general public is asking only, Is your program making our boys and girls healthy? Are you making them physically fit?

Personally, I should like to raise some of these other questions in connection with our peacetime or wartime program. But this is war, and we must ration many things—even our opinions. So I shall limit my comments to this question of fitness.

Delivered at the fall conference of the Women's Section, Southern District of California AHPER, Los Angeles, 1942.

The phrase *physical fitness* has been bandied about very glibly. Many educational crimes have been committed in the name of "physical fitness" by people who have failed to think through the whole problem, people who have failed to understand the concept of total fitness, and people who are unaware of the physiological and psychological implications of the phrase.

Let me give you an example. Shortly after Pearl Harbor, I happened to visit a college in which a friend of mine was teaching. I walked into the gymnasium and found her with her class of college women lined up against the wall in military formation while she tried to teach them the intricacies of "right face" and "left face." This proceeded for the entire hour, and the boredom of the girls was obvious. After class I said to my friend, "What do you think you are doing?" "Well, we're at war, you know." I admitted that we had heard of the War even in Boston. "Well, I thought it might be a good idea, just in case." "In case of what?" I asked. "Well, you never can tell."

I held my tongue, but I felt like the young man who was playing Marc Antony in the senior play. He was having difficulty getting emphasis in his lines, so his teacher told him to say, "Cleopatra," pause while he took two deep breaths, and then go on with his lines. He followed instructions to the letter, walking on stage and saying, "Cleopatra—(sniff! sniff!)—What *have* you done?"

If we are to keep our programs from getting into this same odorous state, we need to examine the concept of fitness for women carefully before we plunge into radical revision. First we must recognize that *fitness* is not a general but a specific term. Mary may be completely fit for her job of teaching school, while Jane may be fit for her job of running a riveting machine. But if they were to exchange jobs, Mary might be completely exhausted by a day on the riveter while Jane would be a complete wreck after attempting to deal with 40 squirming youngsters all day long. Both of them need to be *healthy* if they are to render adequate service on any job, but each of them must have different specific capacities.

We have long recognized this principle in sports. We know that the best weight lifter is not the best tennis player, the best pole vaulter is not the best swimmer, and the best mile runner is not the best sprinter. Underlying the training of all these athletes is this basic value we call health, but the special fitness for each type of performance is highly specific; and the trainer uses a specific training for each group to bring it to its peak of adjustment to the demands of the event.

Consider two running events. The sprinter is trained to go "all out" in the shortest space of time so that he can expend every bit of energy in seconds. The runner must dole out his energy, conserving it so that he is able to last four or five minutes, spending the last bit of it just as he crosses the finish line. The sprinter must have not only speed of legs but speed of physiological adjustment. The miler has the more drawn-out adjustment we call endurance.

How specific these adjustments are may be seen from the experiments of the exercise physiologists. For example, in a training experiment in which one group trains at seven miles per hour on the treadmill and another group at five miles per hour until both are at the peak of "fitness," it can be demonstrated that when both are given the same tests, each group will make its best record—in both duration and physiological response—at the speed at which it was trained. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that from records made at seven miles per hour it is difficult to predict what records the group will make at three miles per hour. Conversely, from the three-mile-per-hour record practically nothing can be predicted as to performance at seven miles per hour.

We saw this clearly in experiments at the Fatigue Laboratory at Harvard University, in which we matched a group of women and a group of men on their performance in "all out" running on the treadmill at seven miles per hour on an 8.6 percent grade. (Honesty compels me to admit that we had to take our best women and match them with the poorer men, but we did have two equated groups.) In spite of the fact that these women could match these men point for point in "all out" performance, we found that they made a poorer record than the men in moderate activity continued for a period of 15 minutes, during which they reached and maintained a "steady state." The women and men were equally "fit" for one type of activity, but the men were more "fit" for another type of activity.

What I am trying to point out is that *fitness* is a relatively meaningless term unless qualified in terms of the activity demanded. We must raise the question, "Fit for what?" The military forces have recognized the pertinence of this question in setting different standards for the different services. They have asked, Are you fit to fly? Fit to carry a gun? Fit to be a paratrooper? Fit to be a commando? Fit to stand on the assembly line? Or, if you are in physical education and have seen some of the programs being offered today, "Are you fit to be TIED?"

For what should girls and women be fit? Should they be fit to fight? To face the dangers of the foxholes of Bataan? To recover from injuries incurred in battle? I think the answer to those questions is NO! We want our girls to be fit to give life rather than to take it; we want them to be fit to *live* lives that will help and not hinder the total war effort, lives that will uphold the ideals of democracy and make the world *fit* to live in.

Underlying this kind of fitness for our girls and women must be the basic quality of health. But on this foundation we must build the specific qualities that will permit them to make the fullest adjustment to the job they have to do.

These jobs of women are many, but we may list them under five general heads. First, their jobs on the home front. Not all of these jobs will be on the assembly line. Women have a job to do in offices, stores, restaurants; jobs pushing slide rules, being nurses, being teachers, and many other "peacetime" occupations. Not all these jobs require great physical strength or endurance. The women in the offices need mental rather than physical endurance. The teachers—but I needn't tell *you* this—need vitality, enthusiasm, nervous stability, and emotional adjustment. And the women in industry are doing heavier jobs every day, but still not the heaviest, so that their need is less for great strength than it is for adaptability. An industrialist recently pointed out that the major problem of women in industry was not what they could *not* do, but what they could. He claimed that women could do everything men could do; the trouble was they could do one thing more—they could and did have children. Obviously we can't alter this basic fact of life, but we can recognize it and prepare our girls to meet this extra job.

Which brings us to the second major job of women, that of having children and making homes for them. For this task they need plenty of health and vitality rather than great physical strength. With our hospitals overcrowded and forced to send mothers home from three to five days after parturition, we must recognize the danger of nervous, rundown mothers and ailing children if our women are not in the best possible physical condition before childbirth.

The third big job is that of community service. More and more our women are taking over the home defense services. They are serving as spotters and air raid wardens; doing USO, Red Cross, Canteen, Motor Corps, and a dozen other services; and trying to provide day nurseries for the children of defense workers. This adds greatly to their already heavy load of peace and wartime duties.

The fourth job they face is that of doing all of their jobs cheerfully while living a life filled with uncertainty and worry. Their husbands, brothers, sons, and sweethearts may be in Casablanca, at Buna, on Guadalcanal, or someplace unknown—but women's work must be done nevertheless, and it must be done with a smile.

And their fifth and biggest job is that of making democracy work here at home. We won World War I, but we slipped when it came to making the democracy for which we had "made the world safe" a vital, functioning principle of our lives in the United States of America. This time, when our nation has gone all out to defend the same principle, we know that such a failure will be suicidal. It is the big job of the women who stay at home to make this democracy a real and living factor in their homes and their communities, as well as in the state and the nation.

To do these jobs well, what do they need? Can we measure that need solely in terms of strength, speed, agility, and endurance? Do these women need to become commandos—or can we safely leave the commando business to Little Orphan Annie, who seems to be doing fairly well with it? Obviously, the first need is for a healthy body with sufficient strength to keep going all day without fatigue. But the endurance needed is the ability to endure monotony and frustration—not the ability to walk 20 miles under a 50-pound pack. They will need agility to keep leaping from job to job all day—but that is not the same kind of agility as is needed to scale a 15-foot wall. They will need speed if they are to finish all the jobs they have to do—but not the same kind of speed that is needed to run 100 yards in 6 seconds.

We could *condition* a whole generation of girls by systematic exercise and still leave them unfit for jobs measured in terms of nervous fatigue, emotional strain, worry, and adjustment to a constantly changing world. Then what do they need? The Greeks had a word for it in their ideal of "a sound mind in a sound body." We firmly believe that our sports program does contribute to such an ideal. (And may I, for the sake of brevity, include dance in the sports program?) But if we are honest about it, we must admit that the sports program is not the quickest way to create a physiological Superwoman. We can build strength, speed, agility, and endurance most quickly by a systematic program of conditioning exercises. But such a program would leave out the factor of *adaptability* to rapidly changing conditions, mental attitudes, nervous stability, emotional adjustment, and the "cheerful countenance which the Lord loveth" when the world is in a mess.

No, the sports program is not the quickest way to build a superb physique, but we believe it has other values that outweigh the purely physical ones and that for our girls and women should come first. I needn't enlarge on those other values to you. We have all been mouthing them for years: exercise and organic stimulation, skills, fun, emotional outlet, mental health, democratic living, and so on. Our sports program *can* do it—but does it? It looks good on paper, bolstered up with high-sounding objectives, and we tend to be pretty smug about it. But deep in our hearts we know that it can achieve those ends only if we make it do so. It all depends upon how we teach.

There is a dairy in Hawaii that advertises, "Our cows are not contented—they are always trying to do better." Our program can achieve its objectives only if we do likewise. But that is another problem, and you did not ask me here today to talk about contented cows. Let us assume that each of us has a perfect program, that each of us is doing a super job of teaching, and that our pupils all have health examinations, are classified for activity, and are well provided for in terms of their individual differences. In other words, let us assume that we are already squeezing every possible drop of juice out of our sports program. I still wish to raise the question, *Is it enough?* Will it make all normal girls fit for their war jobs? Or for their peace jobs? Or are we like the man who drank 12 cups of coffee a day—before rationing, of course. When asked if it kept him awake, he replied: "No, but it helps."

I think that is the answer to the question raised today. Our sports program helps, and it helps a lot. I trust we shall never have to abandon it but will patch it up and keep it—like our cars—running for the duration in spite of rationing. But our sports program cannot bear the whole brunt of preparing our girls to live efficiently in wartime or in peacetime. It is a "white bread" program, and like white bread it must be fortified with vitamins to meet the needs of the consumer completely. The vitamin that must be added is *body mechanics*.

Before you approve too hastily, let me tell you what I do *not* mean by this term. I do not mean more correctives, even though they are a valuable part of our program for those who have defects that can be corrected through exercise. I do not mean more of the static type of posture work of which we have already done so much with almost negligible results. And I definitely do not mean more calisthenics and free standing exercises administered to large groups in the hope that strength, agility, speed, and endurance will be the result.

My plea is for a rational, intelligent kind of body mechanics for the *normal* girl—for every girl—which will give her a sound basis for approaching the problem of using her body intelligently in the activities of daily living. This is a field in which we have barely scratched the surface, but it is a highly fertile field that should be intensively cultivated. The teaching in such a program should be directed toward two main goals, (a) the conservation of energy, and (b) the intelligent expenditure of energy to reach a specific goal.

First, with reference to conservation of energy. We have agreed that we all have more work to do. It becomes imperative that we should not waste energy in needless and awkward movements. We shall all be walking, running, sitting and rising and sitting again much more frequently than we did in those "good old days" of 1940. We should be teaching our girls how to do these things as economically and efficiently as possible. These are basic movements, and we know that all girls will have use for them. But there are many other situations in their lives that we cannot anticipate in detail. To provide for these we must teach basic principles of how to use muscles, levers, and joints to accomplish work with the minimum expenditure of energy. We can illustrate these principles through lifting, reaching, pushing, pulling, stooping, carrying a weight, controlling abdominal muscles in standing and sitting, and using alternate muscles in maintained positions. We can teach them how to rest while working, and we can teach them how to relax when not working. But our teaching must not stop with showing them *how* to do these things. We must teach them *why*. If they really learn both the how and the why, they will be able to carry these principles into other specific tasks that we have not foreseen.

I believe it is possible to teach high school girls the simpler mechanical principles as well as the principles of muscle arrangement and the location and function of the large muscle groups. We do not have to give them a detailed course in kinesiology and anatomy, but we should give them some idea of how the physical machine is put together and how it works so that they will understand the *why* of the principles of movement. This problem of rational body mechanics could be approached from the esthetic angle, but we have not found that approach too successful in our posture teaching. I believe our high school girls today will respond better to a "production approach" on a common-sense basis.

I believe we could go into any factory in California and reduce fatigue by one-fifth if we were given time for an adequate program of physically (and mentally) educating the workers. Let us educate our potential defense workers before they go to the factory. Let us educate our potential mothers, office workers, waitresses, and teachers before they leave our high schools. We have failed to do this to date—but if we could do it for our present high school girls, we could make a real contribution to the war effort in terms of fitness and efficiency.

And now with reference to the second part of the program, the intelligent expenditure of energy to reach a specific goal. We know, as trained physical educators, that exercise in and of itself has certain desirable physiological effects. But we also know that *all* exercise does not produce *all* effects. We know that we must choose a specific exercise to produce a specific effect. So the second aim of our body mechanics teaching should be to provide each girl with a basis for selecting the exercise that will meet her specific need.

We have talked rather grandly in recent years about our objective of giving every girl a skill for physical recreation. We have even fooled ourselves into thinking that every girl who leaves our schools goes out and uses that skill to secure such recreation at least once a week. It would be wonderful if they did, but let us be realists and admit that they don't. Even if they want to, they face reality in terms of time, money, equipment, transportation, companionship, and facilities. A game of golf is not like a piece of knitting; you cannot pick it up in your spare minutes. You must have a block of time, a set of clubs, transportation to the golf course, a companion to play with, and money to pay the greens fee—and balls which are becoming as scarce as hen's teeth, as well as reasonable skill in playing—if it is to be a truly re-creative experience. Not many of our high school graduates can meet all of these requirements.

But suppose they could. We must still face reality in terms of facilities. Consider a city such as Los Angeles with over a million people. If we assume that two-fifths of them are between 20 and 45 years old, we have 400,000 people who need facilities for active recreation at least once a week. Try to visualize the number of golf courses, badminton courts, tennis courts, Y's, and the like needed to accommodate 400,000 people—and don't include the playgrounds, which should be monopolized by those of school age. We just do not have that many places for people to play; but still most of those people do need exercise.

Visualize the adult population of Los Angeles, sitting at their desks or standing on their feet during a nerve-wracking day. Picture them with their occupational stoops, their slack abdominal muscles, their aching feet, their overweight, their underweight, their constipation, their dysmenorrhea, and all the other ills to which the flesh is heir. Most of those people would look better, sleep better, feel better, and be better citizens if they got some exercise. If they can't or won't get it in recreational activities, then we must supply a substitute for them, a substitute that meets each of their individual needs. You and I know that no one simple calisthenic routine will do it. They need to understand the basic problem involved and choose the specific exercise that will help to solve the problem.

The girl who sits all day at a desk with round shoulders and a forward head certainly does not need forward bending. She needs straightening and stretching. The girl who runs a drill press with her feet doesn't need more leg exercise, but she may well need abdominal exercise or exercises to protect the arches of her overworked feet. The mother of a three-year-old child doesn't need stimulating. (Have you seen the definition of perpetual motion? A mother with a three-year-old child!) She needs relaxation. The girl with dysmenorrhea doesn't need reducing, and the girl with constipation doesn't need deep breathing, but they *all* need something. We have been sending these girls and women out of our schools with no basis for choosing an exercise to meet their needs. We exercised them, but we failed to teach them!

Exercise is our business. We know so much about it that we forget that everyone doesn't know as much as we do. This was pointed out to me this summer when I was visiting a friend who suffered with dysmenorrhea. I asked her if she was using any exercise to relieve it. She was surprised and said, "Exercise? I didn't know there was any exercise for that!" I taught her my favorite set of exercises for dysmenorrhea, which she followed faithfully, and to her surprise and gratification the following month she did not have to spend a day in bed during her menstrual period. For ten years she had been needlessly wasting a day every month! Someone had failed her. She should have learned both *how* and *why* sometime in the course of her education.

It is a sad commentary on our teaching that many women think that the sole function of exercise is to remove unwanted fat. They are completely gullible and believe everything they read in the beauty magazines. Fired with enthusiasm they start out on some fantastic set of exercises, the net result being beautifully illustrated by the scene from *My Sister Eileen*, in which Rosalind Russell, a highly intelligent woman, prepares herself for bed after a grueling day finding an apartment in New York City. Before climbing into bed, she stands against the wall, gives her right hip a vigorous bump, then her left hip, and then, completely discouraged, gives up the whole process with the classic remark, "To hell with it! Let it spread."

It seems to me that any intelligent girl who has passed through our educational system should know enough about exercise and mechanics to select an exercise suited to her needs *when* she has such a need. It is possible that many of our girls will never need this "home type" of exercise to supplement that which they get through other, more interesting channels. But many of them will, and we should provide them with a way of choosing wisely.

If we are to achieve this goal, our body mechanics program for all girls should include not only suitable samples of exercises, but the *how*, the *why*, and the *when* for such samples. If we could teach *every* girl these basic facts and teach so well that they would be convinced and really use the proper exercise when they needed it to relieve tension, provide organic stimulation, give relaxation, correct constipation, induce sleep, correct faulty body alignment, and relieve the great percentage of dysmenorrhea that can be ameliorated by exercise, we could make a contribution to the fitness of our women that could be measured in thousands of work hours. We cannot do this with forced calisthenic drills that have no meaning to the girls. We *can* do it in terms of an intelligent body-mechanics program that has carryover because it is meaningful and practical.

An old preacher once gave his formula for a successful sermon: "First I tells 'em what I'm going to tell them; then I tells 'em; then I tells 'em what I told them." Let me follow that formula to the letter by now telling you the three points I have tried to make:

1. Physical fitness is specific, and physical fitness for women is not completely identical with physical fitness for men.

2. The sports program has a real contribution to make to the total fitness of women if it is properly taught.

3. The sports program alone is not enough. We must fortify it by the addition of an intelligent body mechanics program that improves fitness for living because it is meaningful to each girl in terms of her own life and her own problems.

This Is Where We Came In (1951)

In the last few months I have heard a lot of people begin again to use that phrase *physical fitness*. We are beginning to talk about gearing our program to the war effort. We are beginning to push-up our sleeves, sit-up and take notice, and pull-up out of our peacetime doldrums to do another "about face!" Or is it "to the rear, march!"?

Following the sudden outbreak of World War II, we rushed into action. We tried; no professional group tried harder than we to "do something." Some of it was sane, some silly; some of it was well-considered, some hysterical; some of it was carefully thought out in relation to our objectives, some of it blind aping of military programs—but we tried. We gave the shirts off our professional backs, but sometimes we forgot to ask if they would fit—or even cover—the situation.

Well, here we are again at the same point in the plot. Same song, second verse. Did we learn anything? Are we smart enough to use what we learned to do the best possible job of the job we are best fitted to do?

I have in my files an open letter from the Secretary of War to the AAHPER, dated 1943. In part it reads:

> *The amount of military drill which can be given in schools and colleges can also be given after induction into the Army, in a relatively short period of time, and under the most productive circumstances. A good physical condi-*

Delivered at the fall conference, Southern District of California AHPER, Los Angeles, 1951.

> *tion, however, cannot be developed in so short a space of time, and the physical condition of a soldier is of prime importance to the War Department.*
>
> *The War Department does not want to appear to advise upon the makeup of a curriculum, nor to go beyond outlining some of the elements which the Army believes would be advantageous in its recruits. Of these, a good physical condition is extremely important and a knowledge of basic military drill relatively unimportant.*

It is a polite letter, but it is a direct one. It says bluntly, "You tend to your knitting, and we'll tend to ours. Your job, in wartime as in peacetime, is to help educate boys and girls to be fit to live, to work, to play, to love, to worship, to be good citizens who can—if necessary—fight to preserve their freedom to do these things."

Were they? Let me run through just a few of the findings of the Commission on Implications of the Armed Services Educational Programs. No, I am not going to regale you with the percent of rejections for eyes, ears, teeth, venereal diseases, and flat feet. Those figures are important, but they belong more particularly in that area of our program called health education. I am going to stick to findings relating to the physical education activity program as such.

1. Fifty to 80 percent of the boys in various groups lacked the ability to swim; the endurance to walk distances, even without packs; the ability to run half a mile; the ability to perform heavy physical work; strength to lift, carry, or pull their own weight; and the fundamental skills of falling, throwing, jumping, crawling, pushing, carrying, pulling, pivoting, dodging, and lifting. Were they physically educated?

2. Many trainees had negative attitudes toward sports, directly traceable to their lack of skill and poor physical condition. When their condition improved and they learned skills, their attitudes changed from negative to positive. Were they physically educated?

3. The majority of trainees displayed hesitancy and timidity in activities requiring courage or involving physical contact. This timidity was noticeably absent in boys with records of previous athletic participation. Which group was physically educated?

4. Participation in competitive sports maintained morale after the end of the European war, in the rest areas, and in the battle zones.

5. Military drill did not noticeably improve physical condition.

6. Many trainees, exposed for the first time in their lives to regular activity,

good food, and a generally hygienic regimen, commented in effect, "I've never known what it was to feel good before. Why didn't someone force me to get in shape?" Were they physically educated?

7. Constant motivation was necessary to keep the boys participating strenuously in a training program, even though they were aware that their very lives might depend on their physical condition.

8. Purposeful, progressive, interesting activity was more effective in maintaining condition than mandatory routines.

9. Information and understanding of the program was one of the best motivators, particularly among convalescents.

10. Good tests, the purposes of which were understood, proved useful in motivation.

11. When regular activity was discontinued or decreased, condition deteriorated at about the same rate that it was acquired.

12. The success of training programs varied with the sharpness with which objectives were defined, the quality of leadership, the time spent in participation, the vigorousness of the program, and the extent to which the program was geared to the objectives.

On the whole it is not a pretty picture, but so much for the military.

What about the scientists? What have they learned? Let us look at a few statements generally accepted by physiologists and/or psychologists. Many of these will be found in "The Role of Exercise in Physical Fitness," a statement prepared by a joint committee of the AAHPER, the NEA, and the AMA, and endorsed by all three organizations.

1. The normal heart and circulatory system become stronger and more efficient in moving blood to active regions when repeatedly required to do so. Prolonged inactivity is marked by circulatory changes in the reverse direction.

2. Exercise carried to "second wind" results in increased endurance. Exercise carried to exhaustion may do harm.

3. Voluntary muscles increase in size and grow in strength when gradually increasing loads are placed on them to the point where their maximal voluntary pulling power is involved. Climbing, lifting, pulling, pushing, leaping, jump-

ing, and speed running are excellent muscle builders. Muscles weaken with relative disuse.

4. Exercise attempted beyond the capacity of the muscles is performed with strain and distortion by other muscles of the body. The effect may be to stretch, tear, and weaken the fixator muscles rather than to strengthen the supposedly active muscle.

5. Repetition of the same exercise for the same number of times each day increases the skill with which the exercise is performed but does not strengthen the muscle. Muscles worked at the same external load level gradually deteriorate in physiological condition.

6. The effects of exercise are transient.

7. Fat abhors a working muscle, but a conditioned muscle that is not exercised is hungry for fat.

8. An individual who attempts to maintain peak, championship performance level too long goes stale, loses interest and ability to perform.

9. Persons out of training will need a period of conditioning marked by gradual return to full activity.

10. A normal healthy child cannot do himself permanent organic injury by physical exertion, but participation in strenuous exercise—at any age—should be preceded by a medical examination.

11. Individuals vary in their capacity to benefit from exercise.

12. The amount of effort actually exerted by the individual will more significantly determine the contribution of the activity to his physical fitness than will the rules or other specifications that give form to that activity.

13. The psychological limit of performance is much lower than the physiological limit. Effort is usually discontinued because of discomfort, boredom, or dissatisfaction with results rather than from temporarily disabling fatigue or exhaustion. One concomitant of athletic training is to raise the psychological limit and bring it closer to the physiological limit.

14. People will do voluntarily and consistently only those things they enjoy doing. The human being will not consistently do something that is "good for him" unless it gives him satisfaction.

15. Fitness is a specific as well as a general concept, but specific "fitnesses" can be built most quickly in a person whose body is a sound, well-functioning organism with strength, endurance, speed, agility, and skill enough to perform the routine tasks of living without undue fatigue.

16. The individual normally uses less than 10 percent of this potential energy in routine work. In an emergency he calls upon tremendous reserves not usually used.

At this point my pedagogical inclination to expound the obvious makes me want to go back over the list item by item and point out the implications of each statement. But for a professional group such as this, the writing on the wall is clear enough to be read even by those who in patriotic hysteria are eager to run off in all directions. Forced exercise alone will not make boys and girls fit and keep them that way. Fitness is an ongoing process that must ultimately be carried on voluntarily by the individual for himself. We cannot condition boys and girls in terms of specific "fighting fitness" needs and then keep them on ice until their number comes up. But we *can* educate them to build and maintain a condition suited to the needs of their present lives. On this foundation specific fitness for any emergency need can be readily built.

The military has its program, and I have no quarrel with it. But it is not *our* program, because it does not have the same objectives.

In wartime as in peacetime what we need is not just perspiration, but voluntary participation; not commands, but enthusiastic cooperation; not coercion, but competition; not mandates, but motivation; not obstacle courses, but fundamentals of movement; not judo, but strenuous contact sports; not fanaticism, but fun; not 300 yard runs against time, but strenuous games so exciting that the player forgets his breathlessness and pushes himself to second wind; not push-ups in the fourth grade, but satisfying activity requiring the use of the arms; not transient conditioning, but carryover; not a hatred of activity, but the habit of participating in strenuous activity because it gives satisfactions; and fundamental to it all, not temporarily muscled physical illiterates, but skilled educated human beings with courage, initiative, and the habit of being active and feeling fit.

Skill—that much vaunted American know-how! Not just for its own sake, but because it is the basis of joyful, voluntary, strenuous participation that leads to the habit of participation—strenuous participation that leads to the development of strength, endurance, flexibility and agility; participation that develops courage and kills fear; participation that provides its own motivation, that maintains its own morale and "conditions" people to meet whatever demands may be placed upon them.

Education through physical education has long been a peacetime objective of our program. It is a wartime objective, too—the only defensible wartime objective. Let us use the wartime impetus to improve our programs, to get time, money, facilities, equipment, and support for operating our programs. Let us make our programs more strenuous. Many of them should be. But let us do it in terms of our own objectives. Let us tend to our own knitting.

In the early days of World War II, many of us were shocked to hear one of our leaders say, "This War will be won by boys now in junior high school. It's up to us to get them ready." Time proved him right. This time the haul may be even longer. Boys and girls now in elementary school will probably have to help us win this one. A world at war may be the only world many of them will ever know. If so, it seems even more urgent that we do not dissipate our energies getting them fit only to die. Let us help them get fit to live—fully, freely, with health, with satisfaction, and with the joy and fun that should be their birthright. Then if they must die, at least they will have lived fully and joyously for their few brief years. The tragedy of this generation can so easily be—

> *Not that they sleep, but that they sleep*
> *so dreamlessly;*
> *Not that they die, but that they never*
> *lived.*

Our job is to help them live!

II

Perceptive Minds

Relaxation and Kinesthesis (1950)

Relaxation is a popular topic for discussion in this confused, frustrated, so-called civilized culture in which we live—or try to live—today. Everybody is talking about it. Physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, philosophers, ministers, priests, rabbis, mystics, and some writers who elude classification have all produced best-selling books on the subject. About the only magazine that has not carried at least one article on relaxation during the past two years is the Superman comic book—and even there the idea is implicit as the secret of Superman's ability to cope unperturbed with all situations.

The build-ups concerning the need for relaxation repeat each other almost verbatim; but the solutions literally range from the sublime to the ridiculous—from prayer, to psychiatry and pseudo-psychiatry, to foolproof maxims, to the injunction that you can relax by saying, "Let go." (Incidentally, the last solution has been one of the most lucrative, that particular book having sold over 100,000 copies!)

Everyone wants to get into the act. And why not? Popular as the subject of relaxation has become, it is still one of the undefined, or at best, ill-defined, areas of human knowledge. We think we can recognize tension when it exists. We think we can describe the characteristics of several more-or-less standard patterns of the tense individual. We think we know some techniques for reducing certain types of tension under certain conditions, although we cannot always explain why they work in terms that satisfy the physiologist. But to date no one has succeeded in pinpointing all of this information in such a way as to

---

Delivered at the faculty lecture series, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1950.

define categorically and describe precisely tension, or its antithesis, relaxation. We know tension is one of the predisposing factors in certain types of fatigue, but since we become increasingly aware that we do not know what fatigue is either, this does not help the situation to any great extent.

There is some agreement that the principal *causes* of the complex syndrome we call tension are emotional, psychological, mental, or—if you choose—spiritual, rather than structural, anatomical, or physiological. The *manifestations,* however, are physiological as well as psychological and may be expressed in physical responses and changes as well as in mental, emotional, or psychological states and reactions. Briefly, tension is a psychosomatic phenomenon, and in the field of psychosomatics, what is *not* known would fill many more books than what is known.

In the face of this confession of ignorance it requires considerable temerity on my part to point out the evidences of your tensions and then try to teach you how to relax in the next half hour. But just as I believe that the physician, the psychiatrist, the psychologist, the spiritual leader, and the physiologist each have a contribution to make to the ultimate solution of the problem of tension, so do I believe that a physical educator who has concerned herself with problems of muscle action and the uses of exercise may also have something to offer.

I am not a physician, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, nor even a research physiologist. I shall not commit the academic sin of trying to speak authoritatively in a field in which I bear no academic label. I am not an "authority" on relaxation, and I do not believe there is any such animal at the present time. I am a physical educator, and my discussion of the subject of tension and relaxation is in terms of teaching and learning a neuromuscular or psychomotor skill. Moreover, I am a pragmatist, and as I have experimented with techniques and ideas in this field, my first question has been, "Does it work?" The second question, not always fully answered, has been "Why?"

What do we mean by relaxation? Or, more precisely, what are the characteristics of the relaxed individual? Immediately into some of your minds comes the picture of a limp rag doll, a person so completely devoid of the will to move that he appears almost to be falling apart. That is an extreme concept of relaxation but not a very practical one. Such a state may occasionally be desirable, but it is difficult to visualize on a 24-hour-a-day basis. My own definition of the relaxed person is a bit more energetic as well as more inclusive: The relaxed person is one who never wastes energy. He produces maximum results in any situation with a minimum amount of effort. He never runs when he can get there by walking; he never walks when he can stand still; he never stands when he can sit; he never sits when he can just as well lie down; and he never stays awake when he can fall asleep. At first blush that sounds like a definition of laziness, and it can be for a person who has no objectives, no job he finds worth doing, no desires, and no interests. The relaxed person has an objective and does the job, but he gets it done with a minimum expenditure of effort and without wasting energy.

Conversely, then, the tense person is one who wastes energy, spends energy for no useful purpose, gets minimum results with a maximum expenditure of effort. He runs when walking would get him there in plenty of time; he paces the floor when he could be sitting; and he tosses wakefully in his bed when he might better go to sleep. His muscles are in a constant state of hyper-tonus unrelated to the physical demands of the task at hand. Call it what you will: inefficiency/efficiency, tension/relaxation; it is just a matter of definition.

What makes us tense? Let us use an extreme example first to illustrate the point. As we sit together talking, I tread on one of your pet intellectual corns and it makes you very angry. My words registered on your ears and your brain, but your whole body responded. Your heart beat faster. Your respiration speeded up. Supercharged with adrenalin, your muscles tensed, ready to slug me. But wait! You cannot do that! You are civilized, and civilized persons do not slug dignified, middle-aged, lady professors. So your civilized mind inhibits the overt response, but your less-civilized body remains in a state of readiness to act. The motor races, but the brakes are on; all you can do is a slow burn. Now you really are in a state of hypertension resulting from frustration. You repress the direct impulse to slug me, but the stimulus for action remains and finds other forms of overt expression as you grit your teeth, drum on the table, clench your fists, squirm in your chair, tap your foot on the floor, and finally slam the door as you go out.

If you go home and start chopping wood for the fireplace, figuratively splitting my hated skull with each blow, well and good. The state of heightened tension is dissipated in constructive action. But if it is not, and you keep mulling over my irritating behavior, gradually raising the temperature of your slow burn, you will find yourself tossing and turning instead of sleeping that night. A pure case of energy wasting—maximum effort for minimum results.

Less dramatically this whole sequence of events is repeated daily, hourly, or oftener. We are angry; we are afraid; we worry. We are frustrated by a daily existence in which the sour notes interfere with the grand, sweet song. The student union is crowded; the streetcar does not arrive when we do; the daily paper flavors our morning coffee with the acid of terror; we are slighted, unappreciated, or humiliated; term paper deadlines interfere with the pleasures of the beach; rent control may go off, or it may not, depending upon your point of view; the Russians, the Communists, bills, interference with academic freedom—an endless list of multitudinous irritants that gradually tinge our rose-colored glasses with tattle-tale gray.

From day to day it is not the big fears, the big worries, the big angers that make us tense. These can be verbalized, analyzed, and something can be done about them. We become tense from the constant impingement on our conscious or unconscious mind of the minor, unanalyzed, unverbalized red lights that impede our smooth existence. They are omnipresent and inescapable. The slow burn never quite cools off, and we become chronically tense.

The biochemical response to frustration is not selective. It affects all of our muscles, involuntary as well as voluntary. The tense involuntary muscle fibres interfere with our circulation, our digestion, our elimination—the maintenance functions of the body. The tense voluntary muscle fibres interfere with movement, for both the agonists (which shorten to impart movement) and the antagonists (which must relax to permit movement) are affected. Seeking release from this feeling of restraint, we unconsciously resort to meaningless movements, which soon become as habitual as they are meaningless.

Almost everyone in this room is showing some signs or symptoms of tension. Without pointing you out, I see a purse-clutcher, a hand-clasper, a leg-twister, a nose-scratcher, an eye-blinker, a shoulder-hiker, a paper-clip-twiddler. Few of us are psychopathic; most of us are not even unbearably neurotic; we're just normal, more-or-less frustrated human beings. Those inefficient, energy-wasting motions are both the signs of our tensions and our attempts to get release from them. Miserable, insecure mortals that we are, those silly, habitual, wasteful movement patterns are the badges of our frustration.

We complain of being chronically fatigued, and we are, because we are exhausting ourselves by maintaining our muscles in a state of hyper-tonus without allowing them the activity that would complete the normal cycle of full contraction followed by rest or relaxation. Too civilized to slug a world we cannot control, we take it out in nail-biting.

A psychological phenomenon produces a physiological phenomenon, which in turn aggravates the psychological, which in turn aggravates the physiological, and so on and on.

The great big fleas have lesser fleas
Upon their backs to bite 'em,
The lesser fleas have lesser fleas,
And so ad infinitum.

No one technique will ever kill all the fleas, for they breed and multiply too rapidly, but if we can exterminate even one of them, we can—at least temporarily—break the chain and enjoy some relief from their irritating effect. So, emphasizing again that I do not believe my particular theory is "all there is to relaxation," I would like to approach the specific problem of developing the psychomotor or neuromuscular skill of deliberately, intentionally, or consciously causing a tense muscle to relax. That is my particular flea, and if we cannot quite kill him in half an hour, perhaps we can at least give him a stunning swat.

Muscle fibre is living structure. It cannot "do nothing." It must, like any living structure, "do something." Tense muscle fibre is doing something that is not good for it or for you. In its slightly shortened, thickened state it is squeezing the capillaries, raising the blood pressure, interfering with the removal of the end products of contractions, and generally making the restoration of homeostasis difficult. The actions of the muscle fibre are under the control of the nervous system, which is at least partially controlled by the conscious mind. Within limits, your mind can tell the muscle fibre what to do, provided you know what you want it to do.

In the final analysis, any motor skill or neuromuscular coordination is learned by "getting the feel of it." In our more academic moments in physical education we call this "developing kinesthetic perception." If I were teaching you to swing a golf club, I would—in one way or another, by verbal instruction or example, or both—cause you to perform certain motions. You would not say, "I must remember to do this with the biceps, this with the triceps, this with the rhomboids." Instead, you would "get a feeling" as you swing the club. As you practiced, you would attempt to reproduce the feeling or the kinesthetic sensation of your former successful attempts. Eventually, with practice, you would be able to produce a reasonable facsimile of that kinesthetic sensation at will. But before you could do it, you would have had to perceive or *feel* the kinesthetic sensation you were trying to produce.

In the same way, in learning consciously to relax tense muscles, you must first in some way feel or perceive or experience the kinesthetic sensation of being relaxed. Similarly, but conversely, you must develop the kinesthetic perception of the feeling of tension. For many people this is such a constant state that they are never consciously aware of it. The first step in learning to relax, then, is to develop the kinesthetic perception of the feeling of relaxation as contrasted with the feeling of tension.

In teaching relaxation, I begin with a simple stretch—the kind a cat takes when it wakes from sleep. This easy stretch breaks the prevailing pattern of muscle action and sets up a new pattern. It gives gentle stimulation to the circulation by relieving the squeezed capillaries in the alternation of muscle pulls. If the stretch induces a desire to yawn, so much the better. Yawning is a good stretch exercise for the ever-tense muscles of the face.

This general stretch is usually followed by more localized stretches to get at habitually tense areas. Lying on the floor (or on the bed if you are a softie), clasp both hands behind the head and slowly pull the head forward. Don't jerk it out by the roots. Pull slowly but firmly, then "give"; pull a little farther, then "give" again. Technically, this is called a "bounce stretch," and it carries the muscle a little farther each time without producing a reflex resistance. Then clasp the hands in front of the body and pull the shoulders forward in the same bounce pattern. If this stretching makes you feel "good," you are then ready for your first lesson in developing the kinesthetic sensation of relaxation.

The most widely publicized approaches to relaxation use what I term negative stimulation. Either with or without preliminary increase of tension, they simply instruct the would-be relaxer to "let go." Others use the "mental image" approach of the limp rag doll, the snow-ball melting in the sun, the doll with the sawdust running out. I must admit that I have not had good results with any of these approaches, so I have devised my own, which is probably my only unique contribution to the theory of relaxation. During the learning period, I try to induce the feeling of relaxation by giving positive directions for *action* that will induce relaxation physiologically. In other words, I give the subject and the muscle something to do that requires concentration on the activity.

I use slow, controlled motion. Almost any motion will serve. It is done slowly to make it a true muscle action, uninfluenced by gravity or inertia. It is controlled by mental concentration, and if the subject really concentrates on performing the motion exactly, he cannot think of the other problems underlying his tension. I use the counting method to increase the need for concentration, and I am not above using a hypnotically monotonous tone of voice to further soothe the subject.

My favorite exercise for this first lesson has four parts. With the subject lying on his back, knees bent, he contracts his abdominal muscles to raise his coccyx from the floor. Then slowly, vertebra by vertebra, he rolls his back up from the floor until his weight is resting on his feet and shoulders, with the body hanging like a hammock between the shoulders and knees. A slow count of 20 for this hip and back raising is good for a beginner, but a slow count of 60 is more effective and requires real concentration and control. The return to the floor is done in the same manner, vertebra by veterbra, to another slow count of 20. As the hips touch the floor, the feet are slid forward until the subject is lying completely flat. After the first few times he tries this exercise, he has no desire to be in any other position. Then the same slow, controlled, counted movement is used to turn the arms and legs on the long axis, getting the rotation from the shoulder joint and hip joint respectively.

While lying quietly, the face muscles are put through the same controlled routine. The mouth is opened as far as it will go, slowly to a count of perhaps 10; then it is closed slowly to the same count. Similarly, the eyes are opened as wide as possible to a slow count of 10 and then allowed to close slowly to the same count. At this point I have difficulty in some of my classes. If I stop talking, half of the class goes to sleep. At times I find this very restful!

It is obviously not practicable to have you attempt these routines here in Doheny Library, but I would like to have you experience at least partially the kinesthetic sensation that results from slow, controlled movement. So if you can forget your inhibitions about moving in public for a moment, I would like to have you try a few experiments with me.

Hold your right hand down at your side, fingers extended and close together. Bring it up to shoulder level in front of you and lower it. Now try that same motion to a slow count of 20. Keep the arm moving continuously—no jerks, stops, or starts— and plan the movement to bring the arm exactly to shoulder level at the count of 20. Now return it to the starting position to the same slow count. Does it feel any different from your left arm?

Now try the same slow motion in turning your head. Starting with the face forward, slowly turn the head to the left as far as it will go to a count of 10. (Better try a fast turn first to get some idea of how far you can turn, so you can plan your movement.)

Now, if you have lost your inhibitions sufficiently not to mind looking foolish in public, try one last experiment. Open your mouth as wide as you can; now close it as tightly as you can. Then slowly, to a count of 10, open it to the same extent. Now your eyes. Open wide to a slow count of 10; close them lightly to the same slow count.

If you can observe a difference in *feeling* in your arm, neck, and face after these experiments you are beginning to develop some kinesthetic perception of the feeling of relaxation. Now try to repeat the *feeling* without the exercise. You probably will not have too much success from these brief experiences, for learning to reproduce a kinesthetic experience in relaxation, like getting the feel of a golf swing, requires time, concentration, and repetition. But perhaps this will give you at least some idea of what I am trying to convey.

Mastering the kinesthetic perception and learning to reproduce the feeling of relaxation at will is only the first step. When that is done, you are ready to put it into practice in a more constructive situation.

Practice it first in a quiet situation, when you are sitting with nothing demanded of you except your attention; a lecture or a movie will serve. All the physical energy you need is enough to hold your body against the chair. Check to see how much other energy you are wasting. Are your hands gripping the chair arm, your purse or notebook, or each other? Are your feet and legs twisted around each other pretzel fashion? Is your head jutting forward from your hunched shoulders? Is the back of your neck "tight"? Check your kinesthesis, then move yourself to the best-supported and most comfortable position, and let your hands, your arms, your shoulders, your back, your feet, your legs, and finally your face, relax. Let your body rest while your mind follows the lecture. Don't restrain any desire to move, but make the movements slow and purposeful and without unnecessary force or tension. You will have to check yourself from time to time, for the habit of tension is strong, and we feel naked and unprotected when we deprive ourselves of our customary armor.

The next step is practicing relaxation while working at your desk or in the library. Your mind and your hand are active, but you really don't have to hunch your shoulders or twist your feet to enable you to write or read.

When you can move up to being relaxed while driving your car in Los Angeles traffic, you can begin to think you are making real progress. It can be done. The physical energy required to drive a car is very slight unless you try to push it along and clear the road of all obstructions by brute force. Make yourself comfortable against the seat. You can see just as well with your head centered over your neck as you can with your nose against the windshield. Concentrate on driving your own car, and let the other people manage theirs in their own witless fashion. Take the breaks as they come, but don't try for 100-percent domination of the traffic situation. When a red light stops you, relax. Gunning your mechanical and your physiological motor won't change it to green any sooner.

Then try these three progressive tests to see if you are ready to go on with the practice of relaxation. Try to relax while someone else is driving. Recognize that nothing you can do while in the car can or will change the outcome of that particular ride. You made your decision when you stepped into the car. Now sit back and enjoy it. If you can do that, try it when someone else is driving *your* car. Then, if you are so lucky as to have a *new* car without a dent in any fender, try it when you are cajoled into letting someone else "drive it just to see how it handles." If you can relax in that situation, you're ready for anything!

The next step is to practice relaxing when you are standing. Do it the hard way, when you are standing in line at, say, the student union. Why be irritated? You can't move that line faster than it will move itself, so seize the opportunity to rest. Wait until you get to the trays, then leisurely pick one up and place it on the tray rail. Study the salads while you can see them easily; the baked whitefish will still be there when you get in front of it. Somewhere along the line, as you wait, in order not to have your peaceful mental and physiological state disturbed when you reach the cashier, get your change ready!

If you are still with me at this point, you will recognize that the final step of relaxing while walking or working is not a contradiction in terms. Check your walk. How much energy is needed to hold you erect and move your legs rhythmically back and forth under you? How much energy are you wasting by hunching your shoulders, pounding your heels into the pavement, tightening up by trying to hurry, and forcing your head 6 inches ahead of your body? Stop! Take it easy! Just walk! Rhythmic walking is a well-established, purposeful form of exercise and therefore essentially relaxing in character. Hurrying is not. It involves tightening and forced contraction of muscles to try to overcome the natural rhythm of the body. Walk fast if you must by lengthening your stride, but trying to hurry the legs through their accustomed alternation only defeats the purpose.

So you know how to relax your muscles voluntarily. What does that have to do with the total problem as sketched at the beginning of the talk? First, it provides for rest and a return to homeostasis. Second, acutely developed kinesthetic perception of tension provides a cue to the recognition of the mental state and a suggestion for altering it. It is easy to fail to recognize a tense mental attitude at the time it occurs, for since it is mental and emotional in character, the mind and emotions—being involved in it—find it a perfectly rational sort of response. In other words, it is difficult to be objective about our own mental states because we must use the tense mentality to recognize the tension that exists within itself. For example: In an argument it becomes apparent to you that I am losing my temper. You say to me, "Now, don't be angry"; and I snap back at you, "Who's angry?" At the time I really believe I am not, for I think I am being completely rational in my attitude. My body can tell me differently if I am trained in utilizing kinesthetic perception. The feeling of restraint, the clenched fist, the drumming fingers, the tapping foot tell me that I am tense. If I have *really* learned to relax, I do not like this sensation of tension. I consciously relieve myself of it by conscious relaxation, and in the process I reduce my mental tension. For the body affects the mind, just as the mind affects the body.

Nothing worthwhile was ever accomplished by anger, for it is essentially a destructive force. There are wrongs to right and causes worth working for, but the causes will be won faster if all of your energy is devoted to a rational attack on the problem and none is wasted in useless and destructive tension. The tense person wastes energy and usually creates additional tension in other persons. The relaxed person uses all his energy in the accomplishment of the objective.

Use the next irritating situation as a test of yourself as a relaxed person. Something occurs that causes you inconvenience and annoyance. Tense, you grit your teeth, set your jaw, and hurry off full of determination to bring the offender to an accounting. Heels pounding, shoulders rigid, head jutting forward, you burst upon the culprit and vent your wrath upon him. He responds in kind, and a full-fledged crisis is in the making. But wait! You know better than that. You are a relaxed person who uses your energy constructively. You are annoyed, but you recognize the feeling of tension growing out of your annoyance. You consciously relax your tense muscles. Then easily, purposefully, you set out to ascertain the facts of the case. You find you have been misinformed or have misinterpreted the situation. You discuss the matter quietly with the supposed culprit and arrive at an understanding of his point of view. No crisis occurs. Tense, you might have wasted your energy and made yourself ridiculous as well as tired; relaxed, you used your physical and mental energy purposefully to discover the solution to the problem.

Does anyone ever achieve the state of perfect and continual relaxed living? I have never known anyone who did. We all have our emotional breaking points at which conscious control of both mental and physical reactions is lost. But even if we achieve only 50-percent success, we will find—like the man who was asked if drinking 20 cups of coffee a day didn't keep him awake—it helps!

No one can escape the irritations, annoyances, and worries of life. It is entirely normal for your body to respond to these irritations by increased tension. But the relaxed person learns to recognize these tensions when they occur and then consciously changes the physical pattern of reaction to one of purposeful activity. You can do this by consciously substituting the relaxed, smooth, easy movement for the tense, jerky response. In doing so, you release the physical tension so your mind can take a new look at the problem and treat it rationally and effectively instead of emotionally. This is the physical approach to a mental-emotional problem that expresses itself physically through body action.

The Third Dimension (1954)

Modern education has become a three-dimensional process. From 1-D training of the mind, we moved to 2-D education of a mind-body unity. Now, as the psychiatrists are forcing us to recognize the psychosomatic interrelatedness of mind-body-emotions, we are moving into education in 3-D. This third dimension has special significance to those of us in physical education because of our educationally unique concern for bodies in motion and for the constructive utilization of the great emotional potentials inherent in all movement.

If we may define the totally educated person as one who has fully developed his ability to utilize constructively all of his potential capacities as a person in relation to the world which he lives, then we may define the physically educated person as one who has fully developed the ability to utilize constructively all of his potential capacities for movement as a way of expressing, exploring, developing, and interpreting himself and his relation to the world he lives in. This is the part of education we have chosen as our peculiar task. Our job is to help him learn to move his body.

This attempt to educate through movement is no mean task for which we must apologize or make justification. The body is the physical manifestation of the person—his mind, his emotions, his thoughts, his feelings. It is the Self he presents to the world. Only through its movements can he express and externalize the thinking and feeling which makes him a unique person. And as he moves, the very act of movement modifies and affects his thinking and feeling and being.

Published as "The Third Dimension in Physical Education," *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation* 25: March 1954, 27-28.

This job of trying to teach a human being how to express through movement the complex which makes up his Self is not simple. It is complicated from the beginning by the fact that every pupil who comes to us has already had at least six years or more of trial and error experience in learning how to move. Somehow he has achieved locomotion, and he is able to maintain himself in some way against the downward pull of gravity most of the time. But his solution of the gravity problem may be woefully inadequate, and he may be thwarted physically, mentally, and emotionally in many of his life's objectives by the hampering results of his inability to move freely and efficiently.

Our first job is to rework these inefficient movement patterns and build them into more efficient ones while we help him expand his ability to move in new ways so that he may find new avenues of expression.

Ideally we begin in the preschool or at least in the first grade. We provide him with varied opportunities and incentives for experimenting with movement—varied forms and rates of rhythmic locomotion; opportunities to hang and climb and move his body through large and small spaces; opportunities to throw and kick and strike. Our job as teachers is to know when he is ready to accept such opportunities and to provide them in such a way that they are within the range of his capacities for movement and self-expression at that time.

As he becomes kinesthetically aware of his body to the extent that he can consciously repeat movement patterns, we provide him with verbal, visual, and physical cues to direct his movements to more efficient action. We help him relate his movements to other people through partner activities and group formations. We utilize the emotional content of movement, and at times we intensify it by providing challenges to his ego, his desire to test his own abilities. We heighten the mental awareness of movement by verbalizing, by letting him sing about the movement and fit the action to the words.

He creates rhythms and moves to them in his own unique pattern. He stretches his imagination as he moves like the king of the jungle. He learns to control his movements so that he may balance himself in space or so that he may rest quietly. He learns to discipline his body so that it will obey the bidding of his mind and his emotions, and through body movement he finds outlet for the working of his busy mind and his even busier emotions.

Whether he runs and jumps to express his feelings or finds that feelings come from running and jumping, he experiences the dynamics of movement as an interaction of his mind, body, emotions. As his *physical* education advances, he makes progress toward the ultimate aim of total education.

Through the elementary school, the secondary school, and into college he continues to grow in stature and strength, and his experience with movement is expanded as new forms are experienced, new equipment is introduced, and new motivations occur. But the psychosomatic process of dynamic interaction of body, mind, and emotions continues.

His early satisfaction in the simple body-naming rhythmic movements of Looby Loo may develop into the abstract expression of an emotion through dance or the social-sexual-rhythmic satisfaction of the samba. His large body movements which resulted in catching a playground ball are refined to provide expression for aggression, competition, cooperation, and extroversion in the playing of basketball. As an adult he uses the artificial motions of golf as an excuse for getting out of doors, for social and business advancement, for ego-satisfaction, or for release of tension through movement. With each new experience in movement he finds more pathways leading to a better understanding of himself, to establishing his unique relationship to other human beings, and he makes progress toward becoming a better-integrated person, mentally, physically and emotionally healthy.

This is the psychosomatic potential which exists in every class in physical education. To realize even 10 percent of it is to make a vital contribution to the total education of human beings. But to realize even 1 percent of it we must understand much about human beings, and we must use that understanding wisely. We must plan carefully, and we must build and adapt our curricula to both the immediate and long-term needs of our pupils and to the practical situations within which we must work. We cannot always do all that we would like to do, but we can try, and fail, and yet try again.

Many of our failures occur because in our enthusiasm for the more complex forms of movements we neglect the fundamentals. We try to teach basketball to boys whose shoulders are carried so far forward that free movement of their arms is impossible. We try to teach dance to girls whose bodies are so poorly aligned that each step puts further stress on joints already on the verge of collapse. We prate about skills, achievement, rules, strategy, and fair play—but we forget that these grow only out of the ability of the body to move freely and without strain. We get so intent on teaching the *game* that we forget about the bodies with which the game must be played.

Bodies, not games, are our real business. The games acquire significance only in terms of the dynamic interaction of the bodies, minds, and emotions that participate in them. And those bodies must be able to move as freely and fully as possible to make that dynamic interaction a constructive rather than a crippling psychosomatic educational experience.

The starting point for the use of movement as a means of education is to make the body free to act. This involves the alignment of the body parts so that efficiency of movement may be hampered as little as possible by the stress imposed by gravity. It involves freeing the joints for action by putting them in their most advantageous position for movement. It involves the ability to develop speed, power, and strength. It involves strengthening weak muscles so that they become able to move powerfully and easily, or so that they are able to balance the pull of an opposing muscle to fixate part of the body as a base over which other powerful movement may take place. It involves the ability to relax the antagonists while contracting the agonists. It involves stretching tight fascia to make unrestricted movement possible. It involves an understanding of the principles of movement and the ability to apply those principles in action in a wide variety of situations. It involves the awareness of the body and an uninhibited acceptance of it with its capacities and its limitations, both in general and uniquely for each individual. And it involves an emotional drive toward self-expression through free use of body movement.

This is the fundamental part of our job—to start with bodies as instruments for movement and to free them from the restrictions that hamper movement, so that they may become more fully capable of expressing, releasing, or intensifying the thoughts and emotions that are the motivation of movement. This is truly an educational job, and if we can learn to do it well, we shall find that it expands our realization of the educational potential inherent in our more spectacular ventures into dance and sports, into competition and exhibition, into the development of democratic citizenship through group participation.

The total education of any individual may be likened to the music of a symphony orchestra. It develops from the music of many instruments, each of which makes its own unique sound. In that orchestra we physical educators play the bass—the solid, rhythmic undercurrent that holds the more delicate tones together. We produce the essential background against which the musical acrobatics of the mental violin and the emotional oboe are displayed. Without us the melody is thin. The music lacks depth and resonance. For bodies are the physical unity out of which and through which the human mind and spirit grow. The three-dimensional education of those bodies is our business—a business we approach with humility, but with equally great pride.

The Intricate Web (1958)

At the Estes Park Conference we talked about our changing world, about changing concepts of what it means to be a person (female), and the implications of these changes for physical education. These were timely topics. Our world is changing; our concepts of the nature of human beings, including females, are changing; and certainly physical education is affected by these changes. But these are also timeless topics. Human beings have always lived in a changing world. As our universe has evolved, our small part of it has become increasingly complex, and our understanding of what it means to be a person has continually expanded. And in physical education, as in all areas of human concern, it has always been true that yesterday's thinking is not good enough to solve today's problem.

Since we have an anthropologist with us who is much better qualified than I to deal with the whole panorama of human evolution, I shall confine myself to the small part of the picture with which I am most familiar—the development of educational thought in the United States during the past hundred years.

Painted in very broad strokes, the picture of the evolution of educational theory and practice shows three major stages. In the 19th century, education was *fact-centered*. The purpose of education was to teach facts, and the child's mind was viewed as a blank tablet upon which the teacher could inscribe facts with the indelible ink of mental discipline. In a very real sense, education was

---

Delivered at the fall conference, Eastern Association for Physical Education of College Women, Swampscott, Mass., 1958.

something that was done to a child's mind, and the results could be readily measured by determining the number of facts the child's mind retained.

But as time went on and man learned more about his own nature, educators discovered that the whole child came to school. They became enamored of psychology and developed *child-centered* programs in which the whole child learned by doing.

Then again the focus shifted as the sociologists pointed out that human beings live together. The whole child now became a unit that must be fitted into a group, and in the *group-centered* programs groups of whole children learned by doing with others.

Now at the dawn of the space age, man is confronted by his new awareness of a universe so vast and ill-defined that no one knows where the center is or exactly where the child's mind, the whole child, or the human group fits in the total pattern. Faced with the necessity for developing a *universe-oriented* program for human beings living in a universe they only vaguely understand, educators are confused and uncertain. In a moment of panic they are trying to find security by turning back to the educational faith of their fathers, crying, "Facts. We must teach more facts—particularly facts about the physical nature of this illimitable space that now dominates our lives."

The development of education is paralleled by the evolution of what we now call physical education. In the 19th century, physical training entered the educational halls as something that was done to a child's body. It, too, was fact-centered in that the facts of biology were used to account for the effects the exercise produced on the body.

But when the whole child started coming to school, the physical trainers abandoned the concept of the mindless body as the general educators abandoned the disembodied mind. They shifted their allegiance from biology to psychology and developed "theories of play" that pointed out the psychological values inherent in games in which the whole child used the racially old movements of running, jumping, throwing, and striking. The formal, exercise-centered program gave way to the child-centered, natural program, and to emphasize their new identity as educators the one-time physical trainers adopted the slogan, "Education through physical education." In this vein they wrote about physical activity as a medium through which the whole child might acquire an education. Unfortunately the use of the preposition *through* tended to underline subtly the mind-body dichotomy the slogan was intended to erase. It suggested that physical education was not really education, but only a channel through which real education might be induced to flow. Testimony of the deep doubts the physical educators themselves had on this point is the flood of protestations that "physical education *is* a part of total education" that characterize the professional literature of those years. But whenever the educational value of physical education was challenged too severely, they retreated to the security of the past and stood firm on the biological *fact* that physical activity *did something* to the whole child's *body* that was not done by any other educational discipline.

As general education shifted its focus from the whole child to the group, physical education also moved into its *group-centered* phase. The emphasis on the social objectives is evidenced by the title of the 1951 Year Book of AAHPER: "Developing Human Relationships Through Health Education, Physical Education, and Recreation." But again, that invidious preposition *through* left physical education outside the charmed circle of unquestionably *real* education. It was still a "fringe" of the educational group, and like all "fringes" it was vulnerable and often in need of defense. So again and again physical educators found it necessary to fire their biological guns.

These 19th-century muskets have served us well. Trained on state legislatures they have won many battles for laws and requirements, and triggered by evidence that European children were more adept than American children at touching their toes, they have even won a quasi-Cabinet post for physical fitness in Washington.

The wheel seems to have come full circle. Now, at the beginning of the space age, frightened by the possibility of greater muscular strength in the Russians even as academic educators are frightened by Russian possession of facts, physical educators have retreated to their past position of security, and the tattered biological banner of Physical Fitness again waves triumphant from their battlements.

I have great respect for the sciences, both physical and biological. My bachelor's degree was earned in the physical sciences in the very institution that set off the first chain reaction leading to the atomic age. I was well schooled in biology before I earned my master's degree in physical education at an institution that put great emphasis on the biological objectives. But my doctorate was earned in human development, and it is my faith in the process of human evolution that now sustains me.

As we stand on our tiny platform in space, reluctantly relinquishing our belief that man is the center of the universe, I do not find it possible to believe that either physics or physical fitness will save the human race—or that portion of it that lives in the United States. Retreat to the past can provide no real escape from today's problems, and yesterday's thinking is not good enough to solve them. Once again we must look to the evolutionary development of man's understanding of his own nature for the clues to the kind of education that will enable man to keep pace with his own expanding knowledge of the physical universe in which he exists.

Man, like all animals, is a biological-psychological-social creature. Certainly education must minister to all three aspects of his life. But man knows that he is more than a biological-psychological-social organism driven by biochemical tropisms and a set of reflexes that can be conditioned. Man knows that he is a *human* being, unique among the species of the earth.

This sense of his own uniqueness has long sustained his ego-centered belief that the world existed for his use and that he was destined to be its master. But now as he peers timidly into the unknown immensity of a spacious universe that shrinks his own world to pinpoint dimensions, he sees himself as a tiny speck being whirled about in measureless space with millions of other worlds, and his sense of his own identity is threatened. The big questions he must now face are, What is the significance of my human life as I know it? What is the hallmark of my human uniqueness? What is the meaning of my life? These are not the questions of science. These are the questions of philosophy. And I believe that education must move from physics and physical fitness to philosophy if it is going to save the substance and sanity of the human race.

Man is more than an animal. As Ernst Cassirer puts it, "Man has discovered a new method of adapting himself to his environment. . . . Compared with other animals, man lives not merely in a broader reality; he lives, so to speak, in a new *dimension* of reality." Man has climbed the ladder of evolution to a higher rung from which he is able to comprehend the world in a new way—the way of human thought. But just as the 18th-century anatomists searched in vain for the substance of the soul, so today's neurophysiologists can find no trace of a physical substance that can be identified as the thoughts of a human mind. Man's physical structure does not differ from the structure of similar animals, but the miracle of humanness is that the physical structure of man is somehow capable of dealing with its sensory experiences in a different way. Human mentality is not a thing, it is a *process* that transforms the data of sensory perception into the abstractions of human thought. These abstractions have no physical being, but man can retain these bodiless abstractions of sensory experience as the *idea of the experience*. He can remember them, recall them, juggle them in many different ways, and even partially communicate them to other human beings. He can even think about the process by which he does this.

This intangible "thought stuff" which has no corporeal substance is the most vital element in his life as a human being. It influences his physiological reactions, his psychological responses, and his social behavior. It can even interfere with the conditioning of his reflexes and nullify some of his biochemical tropisms. It is out of this "thought stuff" that he weaves what Suzanne Langer has so beautifully called "the intricate web of meaning which is the real fabric of human life."

This capacity for finding meanings is the hallmark of man's uniqueness; in those meanings he must find the unique significance of his life as a *human* being in a universe filled with infinitely diverse forms of life. If education is to minister to the needs of human beings in this ego-destroying age of space, it must become *meaning-centered,* because only in terms of meaning can man discover the significance of his own human identity.

Speech, which is a uniquely human ability, is a way of assigning sounds to meanings. The verbal sound becomes the symbol for the abstraction or concept of the experience it formulates. Man's ability to transform experience into abstractions that can be expressed as verbal sounds has long been recognized. These verbal symbols have been much studied, and most of our approaches to human mentality are based on those studies. But more recently philosophers have been recognizing that the process of human mentality transforms many sensory experiences into *meanings* that cannot be adequately expressed in words.

Much that man finds meaningful cannot be verbalized. Can you describe the aroma of coffee, the color of red, the form of a design, the sound of a concerto, the feeling of a dance, in words? But the unique essence of each of these sensory experiences is *meaningful,* even though it defies verbal description. Each of these unique, nonverbalizable forms represents, stands for, or symbolizes some meaningful aspect of man's *thoughtful* understanding of himself and his universe.

In short, any sensory experience may be transformed into an abstraction that is an "idea of the experience" because that is the way the human mind functions. All these abstractions may be retained, recalled, reflected on, related, and thought about. And this abstraction called thought, which stands for or symbolizes the original sensory experience, has its own meaning—even though that meaning cannot be expressed in words. If it could be, man would have no need to compose symphonies, paint pictures, mix perfumes, or dance dances. But each of these nonverbal forms is an organization of experience symbolizing something of human knowing and understanding. Many of the most important strands in the fabric of human life are *nonverbal meanings.* And many of the strands are abstractions of sensory experience that man cannot communicate—the feelings that constitute his private human knowing and understanding of himself in his world—but these vaguely recognized organizations of experience also give color and depth and texture to the human fabric of *meaning*.

I shall confine my discussion to only one sensory experience—kinesthesia—and limit that discussion to the significance of man's kinesthetic perception of his own movements, because I believe that here is where the clue to the next developmental phase in physical education lies. How man communicates his kinesthetically derived meanings and how other men perceive and interpret his communication are other sides of the story—but these must wait.

My thesis is this:

Human mentality is a process which transforms sensory experience into abstractions or concepts which stand for or symbolize the meaning that sensory perception has to a person.

All sensory perceptions are subject to this process.

Man experiences his own movement as a sensory perception identified as kinesthesia.

Kinesthetic perceptions, being of the same nature as all other sensory perceptions, are subject to the mental process which transforms them into retainable abstractions or concepts which stand for or symbolize the meaning inherent in that perception for the person who experienced it.

Therefore, movement, as such, is a meaningful experience to a human being because the kinesthetic perception of movement supplies one of the strands out of which the fabric of meanings which constitute a human life is woven.

In short, kinesthetic perception of movement is one of the sources from which man derives the meanings of his life as he carries on the uniquely human mental process of transforming sensory perceptions into human thought.

This is the theory of meaning and movement that Lois Ellfeldt and I have been trying to develop. At the moment it is only a theory, and I have no scientifically validated facts to offer you in its support. It was developed by using the methods of philosophy. But while philosophy deals with intangibles, its methods are as rigorous as the methods of science, and so I present to you with no apologies our philosophically developed theory. Perhaps twenty years from now we shall have amassed enough experimentally validated facts to convince even the most scientific-minded fact lover. Perhaps not; but that remains to be seen.

Our theory began as a hunch—as all theories do—that occurred simultaneously in our separate minds while we were both reading Susanne Langer's

Philosophy in a New Key some years ago. Interestingly enough, we both marked the same passages in our paperback editions and scribbled almost identical questions and comments in the margins. We talked about this now and then at coffee, but we were busy with many things, and so the idea was allowed to lie fallow in our minds. But being a productive idea, it began to germinate and send forth little shoots of thought.

Two years ago, Dr. Ellfeldt and I finally settled down to write a book on movement that we had been talking about for a long time. We had a beautiful outline for it, but by then the little idea-germ had sent so many tiny shoots into the ground of our thinking that we could no longer cultivate the familiar ground of our thinking without taking it into account. So we threw away the outline we had prepared and started over.

We began by asking, "What is movement all about? What are its essential elements? What is its significance in man's life?" But here we encountered new difficulties. Dr. Ellfeldt is a dancer with a strong background in therapeutics or corrective physical education. My own primary interests have been in kinesiology and the area designated as body mechanics. Both of us know something about sports. So as we tried to analyze "movement" we found ourselves using half-a-dozen different vocabularies, each of which referred to some *specific purpose for moving* rather than to the *elements* common to all movement. We were spending so much of our time trying to explain "what I mean" by acting out our ideas or drawing parallel examples from several areas that we finally decided to discard all of these purpose-contaminated vocabularies and develop a new set of verbal symbols to facilitate our communication.

Again we posed the question, "What elements can be identified in *all* movement?" There appeared to be three quite distinct but interrelated elements. Obviously movement is a structural phenomenon. As man moves, a dynamic pattern is constructed in space by the changing positional relationship of the somatic structures. But movement is also a sensory phenomenon. As man moves, this dynamic pattern is perceived as a sensory pattern by the complex kinesthetic sensorium. But human movement is also a meaningful phenomenon. The structural pattern and its accompanying sensory pattern have some significance because they are elements in a response made by a sentient person to some aspect of his external and/or internal environment.

We then tried to express these structural, perceptual, and conceptual elements in new words that owed no allegiance to any specific purpose for moving. We used the Greek word *kinein*—which means "to move"—as the root. Then we combined it with parts of other words that referred to a structure, perception, and conceptualization or thought. The words we devised were the following:

Kinestruct—which refers to the dynamic somatic form created by the structural masses of the body in motion. To kinestructure means to create a kinestruct.

Kinescept—which refers to the identifiable sensory form created by kinesthetic perception of the kinestruct. To kinesceptualize means to perceive a kinescept consciously.

Kinesymbol—which refers to the meaning *or symbolic import the kinescept-kinestruct has for the person within the socio-psychosomatic context of the situation. To kinesymbolize means to conceptualize the import or meaning of a kinestruct-kinescept consciously.*

We found that the meanings of the words kinestruct and kinescept were reasonably easy to grasp. After all, we had spent our lives dealing with the structural aspects of movement, and we had always been aware of the sensory nature of kinesthetic perception as the "feel" of movement. But trying to understand the nature of the word kinesymbol led to much mental anguish!

Again and again we had to remind ourselves that *human mentality* is a *process* that transforms sensory perceptions into abstract forms or symbols. We told each other that while words were verbal symbols, music was a nonverbal symbol and pictures were nonverbal visual symbols, and both the sound of music and the sight of pictures were meaningful because they symbolized or stood for a thought that had meaning even though it could not be put into words.

What then is the *meaning* of a *kinesceptual* form? It is identifiable only as a *kinesymbol*—a meaningful formulation of kinesthetic experience that cannot be translated into any other symbolic form. It is not verbal, visual, or auditory, or anything else but what it is—a formulation of experience perceived kinesthetically. A kinesymbol contains its own unique meaning in its own unique sensory form. And as I mentally swung a golf club to kinesceptualize the "feeling" of a golf swing, and Dr. Ellfeldt mentally leaped into the air and came down in a circular fall to kinesceptualize the "feel" of a movement she enjoys, we both knew that these kinescepts were kinesymbols standing for experiences that had satisfying *meanings* for us, because we had found these experiences "meaning-full."

A kinesymbolic meaning may be transient or long-lasting. It may be vague or well formulated. It may be fragmentary or complex. It may symbolize something as functional as locomotion or as nonutilitarian as standing on your head to feel how it feels to stand on your head instead of your feet. But every human kinestruct-kinescept is potentially meaningful as a kinesymbolic formulation of experience which adds one more trace of *knowing about* ourselves and our world to the intricate web of meaning that is the fabric of human life.

A kinesymbol may be satisfying, as a sound that is heard, a picture that is seen, or an odor that is smelled may be satisfying. It may be dissatisfying and disturbing, as a sound or sight or odor may be "bad" as well as "good." But the fact that we can identify the distinction between "like" and "dislike," between "enjoy" and "annoy" in our kinesceptual experiencing of our kinestructs demonstrates that those kinescepts do have meanings implicit in the perception as such. (When I tried to do a mental circular fall, I winced. And when Dr. Ellfeldt mentally swung my golf club, she frowned.)

There are movements we like to do because we enjoy the feel of them; there are movements we do not like to do because the feel of them is somehow distasteful to us; but satisfying and dissatisfying movements are not the same for all people. Neither do all people find the same satisfactions in various kinds of music. Some people like their art forms angular; others prefer more fluid lines. These likes and dislikes are expressions of the totality of a person and the meanings that make his own life meaningful to him.

Educators have long ago accepted art and music as meaningful nonverbal forms of human experience, and there is general agreement that there is unique educational value in seeing organizations of color and hearing organizations of nonverbal sounds. It is conceded that these experiences enlarge the total mentality of the child by increasing the range of sensory experiences that are meaningful to him as a human—as distinguished from an animal—being.

My thesis is that the sensory experience of movement is as *inherently meaningful* as the sensory perception of color, design, and musical sounds. Kinesymbolization is another of man's unique ways of knowing something about what it means to be a human person in a physical universe.

If we believe that it is good to learn, to know, to experience ourselves in our world in many ways, then we must believe that it is good to move; because by moving—creating kinestructs and experiencing kinescepts—we add significance, import, meaning, knowledge—*kinesymbolic knowledge*—to our total store of "knowing about ourselves in the world," which is the source of the meanings we find in our human lives. And so the basic assumption of movement education is that there is unique educational value in the kinesceptual experience of moving, which is to say that kinesception of kinestructs is in and of itself a meaningful educational experience.

As we create our kinestructs in many situations, their kinescepts may acquire many encrustations of added symbolic meaning, derived from the total intellectual-emotional interpretation associated with the situation. Thus the kinesymbol may become a complex symbol that stands for *all* the meanings in the situation in which the kinescept was experienced.

As we recreate such kinestructs, their kinescepts will then kinesymbolize for us something of all of those meanings and feelings and may, in fact, become a symbol in the Freudian sense as well as in the "stand for something" sense. To some extent, this probably happens to all of our kinestructs and kinescepts. Certainly habitual posture has emotional significance, as all of us know from trying to persuade someone to change his postural habits. His habitual posture feels right to an individual because it is a kinesymbol of how he feels about himself.

How many concepts are associated with the simple kinestruct of raising one arm overhead? They range from "Heil, Hitler!" to a child's eagerness to answer a question, to "two points" in basketball, to the urgency of a child's need to "leave the room." Each of these associations has its own emotional overtones, and some remnant of the emotions associated with the kinescept are incorporated into the kinesymbolic import of every subsequent arm-raising.

The recreation of a familiar kinestruct-kinescept is like the actual or mental rehearing of a familiar song. The song brings back many feelings and meanings associated with it, and "Stars and Stripes Forever" evokes feelings quite different from "Let Me Call You Sweetheart," because we associate different situations with the two songs.

In the realm of movement, the significance of associated meanings in determining the "quality" of a kinestruct suggests many fascinating fields for exploration. What happens when the performer who has kicked in a leotard in a dance studio tries to kick in a sweat suit on the football field? And vice versa! What meanings are associated with sustained and percussive movement that make them satisfying or dissatisfying to certain persons, sometimes to the point where they resist doing the dissatisfying kind of movement?

Every kinestruct-kinescept has some associated meanings, because man always moves within the context of a situation. But underlying all the associated meanings is the kinesymbol in its purest form—the meaning we find in movement for its own sake as a sensory experience that increases our understanding of ourselves because it adds one more trace of *meaning* to the fabric of a human life.

This experience, like all human experiences, has certain concommitant values, which are biological, psychological, and sociological in nature. But if we could clearly identify the unique meaning of movement as a kinesymbolic form of human meaningfulness, we would have no need to try to justify physical education (which is and always has been movement education) by scratching around for concommitant values. They would still be there. Muscles would still be strengthened by contracting against resistance. Psychosocial interactions would still occur on the tennis court. Human relationships would still be developed, and we would still have competition. But by identifying the unique value of movement as a meaningful and therefore educational experience, we who call ourselves physical educators would be able to stand up proudly in our own educational right, and we could identify ourselves as educators who guide one meaningful form of educational experience.

I think we shall finally achieve this upright posture when we can give a clear-cut answer to the question, "Why ask a child to stand on his head?" Perhaps we can answer it with another question, "What is educational about listening to a zither?" I believe it is good to stand on your head to find out what it *means* to you to stand on your head. If you are a person, then standing on your head is a meaningful experience because it contributes something to your total understanding of your nature and the nature of the world; it is therefore an educational experience for the reasons that hearing the organization of sounds produced by plucking a zither is an educational experience.

What does this theory mean in relation to curriculum, methods, and total program for physical education in a space age? That remains to be seen. But I hope it will stimulate your thinking during this conference as we move toward the development of a platform on which man can stand as he continues his never-ending search for the meaning of his own identity as a human being in a spacious universe.

This Is Physical Education (1965)

For those of us who profess to be educators, these are indeed exciting, challenging, and often confusing times. All areas of human knowledge are in a state of ferment, and new theories about the what, the how, and the why of the universe of man's existence are developing at such a rapid rate that new books are now outdated before the ink is dry on their pages. Yet somehow, despite our own partial understanding of these emergent ideas, we who call ourselves educators must try to sort out these newer concepts and organize them into curriculum-sized bites, even as we try to incorporate them into educational theory and practice in the hope of developing better teaching, better learning, and better understanding in our own particular area of education.

In the realm of educational theory and practice, the crucial questions of today, as of yesterday, are, How do people think? How do they learn new knowledge? How do they use such knowledge? How do they behave? How do they learn new ways of behaving? How do they use these learned behaviors?

Fifty years ago, the answers to these questions rested on the belief that the mind of man was a unique and separate entity that had no counterpart in the living body of lesser creatures called animals. Today, all science supports the belief that man, like all living creatures, is a fully integrated being, whose specialized form of mentality is a function of his specialized organic structure as a conscious, intelligent, self-directing, human being.

Delivered at the fall conference, Southern District of California AHPER, Northridge, 1965.

Consequently, the questions about the processes of human thought are now being answered in terms of concept formation and the symbolic representation of such conceptually structured understanding—rather than in terms of facts, discrete bits of knowledge, and rote learning. And as educators concern themselves with the concept of idea-directed forms of behavior, the questions about human behavior are also being answered in conceptually structured and symbolic terms.

In every subject in the school program, curriculums and methodologies are now being restudied in the light of these new insights into the nature of the processes of human knowing, thinking, behaving, and learning. In physical education we have been dragging our heels, but we are now off to a late start. Our inertia has been overcome by the establishment of a Curriculum Commission in the Physical Education Division of AAHPER. This Commission has taken the first steps toward the ultimate implementation of a five-to-ten-year study designed to relate these newer insights into human learning to the curriculum of physical education. This task will take real commitment, time, and money—and as yet only the commitment is in hand. But the attempt to secure time and money is now under way.

Meanwhile, as a sort of stopgap measure, the Physical Education Division has financed the preparation of the small brochure called *This Is Physical Education*. This two-year project was carried on by a small committee, which secured much help from many professional sources. The brochure is not comprehensive; it is not definitive; but it is a start. And it does describe the present curriculum of physical education in terms appropriate to man's emergent insights into the nature of his own human learning processes.

Many school systems have already ordered copies for their teachers, administrators, parents, and community groups; many teacher preparation institutions are using it in their major classes and with elementary school teachers. In it, the curriculum in physical education is described as a selected sequence of experiences in which children *learn to move* and *move to learn*. The educational purposes served by these learning experiences are spelled out under five headings:

To help children learn to move skillfully and effectively, not only in exercises, games, sports, and dances, but in all active life situations;

To develop understandings of voluntary movement and the ways in which individuals may organize their own movements to accomplish the significant purposes of their lives;

To enrich understanding of space, time, mass-energy relationships, and related concepts;

To extend understanding of socially approved patterns of personal behavior, with particular reference to the interpersonal interactions of games and sports;

To condition the heart, lungs, muscles and other organic systems to respond to increased demands by imposing progressively greater demands upon them.

We might well spend many hours exploring any one of these educational purposes, but I have chosen to use this time to examine the first one, "to help children learn to move skillfully and effectively."

We have noted that educational theory is concerned with the processes of knowing, thinking, behaving, and learning, as observed in human beings. In this context, we may identify moving as a way of behaving and recognize learning to move as the process of learning new forms of behavior. In these terms, then, let us review what we now know, think we know, or do not know about the process of learning to move—or behave—skillfully, effectively, and purposefully, as this process has been observed in both animals and human beings.

Structurally speaking, each species has its own characteristic arrangements of bones, articulations, muscles, and nervous system. The basic movement patterns characteristic of the species appear to be determined by these arrangements, and direct stimulation of the motor cortex in the unconscious animal will elicit these characteristic movements. These stereotypical patterns are always a fully coordinated response that involves every fiber of the animal's being. In other words, stimulation of the motor cortex does not elicit isolated muscle contractions or induce one part of the body to move in a separate action divorced from the context of the fully integrated whole. As John Hughlings Jackson observed some 60 years ago, "Nervous centers know nothing of muscles; they know only movements." Or as Frances Hellebrandt phrased it more recently, "Movements—not muscles—are recorded in the cortex."

In the newborn infant, either animal or human, these characteristic motor cortex patterns are recognizable, but rather vaguely defined, and often executed in a manner suggested by the word *explosive*. They may be elicited by any strong stimulus—bright light, loud noise, pressure—within the context of a characteristic startle pattern, in which the whole body moves convulsively, exhibiting tremors of small amplitude, as if the body were oscillating to permit the infant to scan himself and his surroundings as he attempts to locate the sensation.

At this point it must be noted that the sensory half of the nervous system is not fully functional at birth and that the infant is not yet able to discriminate clearly among the various kinds of sensation he may experience. The term *synaesthesia* is used to describe this relatively undifferentiated pattern of sensation, which might be described further as "a vague, pervasive sense of being alive."

Within this synaesthetic awareness of being alive there is probably no clear-cut distinction made between self and surroundings. However, it appears that the sensations evoked by events occuring within the boundaries of self play a major role in the process of achieving such self-identification. These inner sensations include both the reports of the enteroceptors, which convey the sensation of "how being alive feels in me" (or how I experience the state of being alive), and the reports of the proprioceptors, which convey the kinesthetic sensation of "how moving feels in me." This complete sensory pattern of awareness of living and moving is the infant's first form of knowing. At this stage the terms *cognitive* and *affective* are not wholly appropriate, but this vague awareness of knowing is the forerunner of the more clearly differentiated forms of cognitive-affective awareness that will in time be experienced.

As the motor cortex is stimulated by this composite pattern of sensation, the gross movement patterns characteristic of the species are elicited within the startle pattern of tremor, oscillation, and scanning. Initially, there is overinvolvement of the trunk, head, arms, and legs as the whole infant tries to relate himself to this new sensation. Then, as each movement serves to modify the inner situation and the sensory-affective-cognitive pattern of awareness in some way, the infant seems to discover that some elements in the movement pattern produce rewarding or satisfying patterns of affect, while other elements produce patterns of affect that are less satisfying and possibly unpleasant. Within this context of experimentation and evaluation, the infant begins to discover how to organize his own movements into patterns that produce the satisfying-rewarding patterns of feeling, sensation, affect, and cognition.

In observing infants, either animal or human, one has difficulty sorting out these sensory-motor interactions within the process of learning to move skillfully and effectively in relation to something the infant knows or knows about. We can see the outlines of these interactions more clearly in a "conditioning experiment" conducted in the research laboratory. For example, if an infant rat is placed in a situation, he can be induced to move by any strong stimulus. These movements are characteristically ratlike, and they occur within the startle pattern of tremor, oscillation, and scanning. Within the range of these patterns, if the rat moves in one way, he is rewarded; if he moves in another way, he is punished. By relating his awareness of moving to his awareness of being rewarded or punished, the rat soon learns to organize his movements into the rewarded pattern whenever the stimulus is operative. And we may note here that the whole rat is involved in this learning process, rather than just the nerves and muscles of its lever-pushing leg.

Outside the laboratory, we may see this same process occuring in a young bird as he learns to fly. When he is pushed out of the nest, or falls out, the "feeling of falling" serves to elicit the gross patterns of bird-type movements within the context of the startle pattern of tremor, oscillation, and scanning movements. At first the bird seems to be thrashing about in an attempt to "do something," without quite knowing what he is trying to do. Then, movement by movement and sensation by sensation, he sorts out the movement pattern that produces the rewarding feeling of "being supported in air." Thus, we may say the bird has learned the skill of flying, and from then on he can use this skill whenever it serves to satisfy his needs.

Which brings us to the troublesome question, Where are such skills stored, retained, or recorded within the bird, the rat, and the human infant? Since all of the prime questions of modern neurophysiology have to do with this problem as it relates to all kinds of learning, we need not be embarrassed to admit that we cannot answer it in categorical terms.

We do know, however, that direct stimulation of the motor cortex will not elicit the skillful movement patterns that have been learned by the process of sensory-motor interaction described above. Rather, even in the most highly skilled subject, stimulation of the motor cortex elicits only the gross, stereotypical patterns identified with the species. Similarly, the refined coordinations of a learned or skilled movement pattern cannot be elicited by direct stimulation of either motor or sensory nerves. Rather, the subject can exhibit these skillful coordinations only when he is conscious and in full command of all his faculties. Then, and only then, does he move skillfully and effectively in relation to some objective that he knows or knows about.

The implications of this generalization are magnified by the commonly accepted concept of *voluntary movement*, or movements that the subject executes voluntarily, or of his own volition, as an alternative to moving in some other way or to not moving.

This concept of choice and volition is implicit in all conditioning experiments. At all times, the rat is anatomically able to turn right or left within the maze, for example, or to stop in its tracks, shivering in indecision. But the rat knows from experience that a right turn has been rewarded, and so he moves in the previously rewarded direction. Moreover, if those areas of the brain associated with the process of knowing are blocked out or destroyed, the rat is no longer able to make this knowledgeable selection among anatomically available movement patterns, and he will no longer exhibit the learned skill of moving effectively in relation to the stimulus and the satisfying situation.

These observations indicate that the neural circuits that implement the processes of affective-cognitive knowing are involved in the process of organizing movements in knowledgeable ways, but they throw no light on the differences between rat learning and human learning. In general, these differences are not clearly apparent until the frontal lobes of the human brain are more fully functional, so we must seek these differences in experiments with older children.

In one such set of experiments, the scientists tried to devise a movement-task that could be learned by children but not by animals. The first task involved learning to change direction on an unmarked field, using the four-turn sequence of right-left-right-left. With appropriate conditioning, rats could learn this movement sequence, but they could not retain it for more than 10 seconds. Dogs could retain it for a longer interval. So the experimenters devised a more complicated sequence—right-right-left-left-right-right-left-left. Rats could not master this sequence, and dogs were only partially successful, with very short retention span. But three-year-old human children could do what you and I have done—they could grasp the *idea* of the sequence, and having done this, they could organize their movements to demonstrate the pattern of that idea. They could do this before they could verbalize about this idea and before they had a clear conception of right versus left. Also, having grasped the idea, they could retain it indefinitely.

We might explore these animal-human differences further by trying to teach a dog and a child to do a tipup or headstand. The dog will learn by being placed in the desired alignment and rewarded or punished in some way as he succeeds or fails in his attempt to find the coordination that will maintain him in this position. The child may begin his learning in the same way, but he quickly "gets the idea" of what he is trying to do, and from then on his attempts to find these rewarding coordinations are obviously idea-directed or conceptually structured.

So we may observe that human beings *can* discover how to organize their own movements into effective patterns by thrashing around within the gross patterns characteristic of the species—as the rat did, as the bird did, as the dog did, as the infant did—trembling, oscillating, scanning self and environment for clues to the movement patterns that will produce the rewarding pattern of knowing. All of us do this in moments of panic; all of us do this to some extent whenever we attempt to organize our own movements into an idea-structured pattern that we do not yet fully comprehend. We may also observe that under certain circumstances human beings *can* be conditioned to turn right or left by an imposed system of rewards and punishments.

But if we really begin to examine our own human experiences, we recognize that human beings learn to move in their own human way by having an idea or a concept or a conception of what they will try to do and then trying to do what is suggested by that idea. This does not wholly eliminate the tremors, the oscillations, and the scanning movements; it does not eliminate the trial-and-error process; it does not eliminate the awkward overinvolvement of the whole person in the initial attempts to implement the idea. But most certainly "having an idea" does facilitate the process of learning to organize movements into the specific dynamic patterns denoted by the idea, and within that idea-structured attempt the process of refining the movement pattern can proceed more effectively. And surely all of us will verify the generalization that we can retain such ideas indefinitely, thinking about them and clarifying them without making an overt attempt to execute the denoted movements, and that the results of this thinking will be evidenced in our subsequent attempts to execute the skilled movement. All of which is to say that man's peculiarly human ways of knowing, thinking, and learning are evidenced in the process of learning to behave skillfully and effectively as he moves about in relation to his own peculiarly human purposes.

But man's peculiarly human ways of knowing, thinking, and behaving do not stop there. Men are also able to contemplate ideas about *what might be possible* and then try to make that possibility happen. When Ed White stepped out of the capsule to walk in space, he was doing just this. He was testing an idea about what might be possible. No man had ever walked in space before; Ed White did not know that this could be done. But he believed it was possible, and he risked his life to test that possibility.

Through the centuries many persons with inquiring minds have repeatedly contemplated the possibility of reorganizing materials they knew about into new forms of manmade reality that they had never experienced. Step by step these persons devised new ideas about how one might support his own weight in space. Step by step they tested the validity of these ideas by organizing their own behavior in these idea-structured ways—with some tremors, of course, and with some oscillations, and often with excessive and ineffectual involvement of the whole person. Sometimes they failed. But moving step by step they eventually succeeded, and so in our own time all of us were to know the excitement of seeing Ed White move out of the sheltering capsule and walk in space, supported by devices shaped by human understanding.

Perhaps, then, we who call ourselves physical educators can also contemplate the possibility of developing our understanding of man's peculiarly human ways of knowing, learning, and behaving into a curriculum that spells out all the interactions among all these processes within the context of the experiences called physical education. In this attempt, we must not ignore any of our educational purposes. We must continue to examine the physiological effects of moving on the heart, the cardiorespiratory system, and the muscles. We must continue our exploration of the kinds of ideas and conceptions children may abstract from the many kinds of perceptual data that become available to them while they are moving within the context of the physical education class. And we must do much more to explore the connotations of the symbolic movement patterns called exercise, games, sports, and dance.

But I have chosen to focus our attention on the process of learning to move, as such, because I believe that any educational interpretation of physical education will finally stand or fall in terms of this process—which gives the field its unique identity within the school program. There has never been any real question about the generalization that moving has an effect on physiological systems. No one has questioned the generalization that children can learn while moving as well as while sitting in classrooms. The critical questions of educational interpretation are these:

Are the intellectually defined processes that implement man's understanding of ideas, concepts, and symbols used and developed within the process of learning to move skillfully, effectively, and in personally rewarding ways?

Do the experiences included in the curriculum of physical education make full use of these processes and further such intellectual development?

To both questions, the answer is yes. And this answer is supported by every emergent theory about the nature of human knowing, learning, and behaving, and every theory about man's ability to contemplate the possible.

Can we who call ourselves physical educators possibly hope to walk on air in the most exalted realms of educational theory and practice, fully-supported by well tested forms of human understanding?

I do not know. But with Ed White, I believe it is possible.

And so I urge you to read the little brochure called *This Is Physical Education,* which is a small step toward the achievement of that possibility. And in the coming years, I urge you to try to behave in ways that will support the ongoing attempt to shape our understanding of the curriculum of physical education into new and manmade forms of educational reality.

Learning and Moving (1971)

Much of my own best thinking about learning has been done in seminars that offer students a chance to experience their own learning processes before we start talking about them. In such a seminar, I might begin by asking the students to consider a familiar object, such as a chalk stick, a lemon, or a kumquat. But you may find it convenient to consider your own hand.

Glance at your hand, casually. Then look away and try to tell yourself what you saw. You might say, "I saw a hand, which I recognized as my own hand." Or you might say, "I saw a square palm with stubby fingers and a short thumb, or a rectangular palm with long, slender fingers and a short, stubby thumb."

But this description would say little to a person who could not relate it to some conception of a hand, a palm, a finger, and a thumb. How might you describe the shape of your hand? The shapes of your several fingers? The shape of the thumb? And how might you describe the relations among these shapes?

Perhaps you now see your hand as a square or a rectangle with five projecting rectangles—four in a row, one jutting off at an angle. And you could sketch this arrangement in a few lines, while it would take hundreds of words to describe the relations among the lines in your sketch.

Then, while you were thinking about the shape of your hand, you may have noticed that the palm, fingers, and thumb are all crisscrossed with many

---

Delivered at the Conference on Early Childhood Movement Experiences, Virginia Education Assn. and Virginia AHPER, Farmville, 1971.

intricate lines. You can visualize the patterns made by those lines, and you could easily show that pattern in a quick sketch; but again, it would take thousands of words even to begin to describe these lines and the relations among them.

Fascinated with these patterns, you might be tempted to trace some of these lines with a finger tip, so you could feel the pattern in your hand. Can you find any words to describe your awareness of that patterned feeling?

Then you might explore other relations in your hand by touching the tip of your thumb to each finger in turn—perhaps marvelling at the fact that man is the only living creature blessed with an opposable thumb. Then you might wonder about your ability to make a snapping sound by bringing your thumb to your middle finger. Can you make that sound with your thumb and index finger? Your thumb and ring finger? Or little finger? Why? Why not? Where does the "snap" occur?

This might remind you of one of the many hand games your mother, or your grandmother, taught you, such as "here's the church, and here's the steeple—open the door and see all the people." Can you do that one with your eyes closed? How do you know what you are doing? How do you know that you are doing it?

Or you might make your hand into a claw, by increasing the tension in all muscles simultaneously. Then shake your hand to relax it, and put it out of sight.

What do you know about your hand? What did you see? Hear? Touch? Feel? Move? Can you put all of this knowing together in one complex conception of something called "a hand" or "my hand"? Can you think about that complex conception without need for words to explain your comprehension of all the relationships within it? Can you relate that complex conception to a conception of a claw? A fork? A stalk of bananas? A cup?

Can you relate your hand conception to the idea connoted by the familiar phrase "hands across the sea"? Or the phrase "reach out and touch your neighbor's hand"? Do you want to do or perform the actions suggested by the "neighbor" phrase? Then do it. Or, as students are wont to say, "If it feels good, do it" . . . unless your neighbor objects . . . or you think he might object. . . .

Or think about the idea suggested by the phrase "my heart is shaking hands with yours." Surely your neighbor won't object to that idea, so convert it into the action of actually shaking hands with your neighbor. Did you say anything to your neighbor while you were shaking hands? Did you have to?

Then settle back in your chair and think about the question, What did I learn from these experiences? Did I learn anything about hands? Did I learn anything about the process of conceptualizing a sensory experience? A movement experience? A learning experience?

On occasion, I may try to put the sense of these experiences together in a few words written by a poet named Wallace Stevens. He put it this way:

To see, to hear, to touch, to taste, to smell . . .
To experience . . . to feel . . .
That's NOW. That's this. . . .

And out of what one sees and hears
And out of what one feels
Who could have thought to make
So many selves, so many sensuous worlds. . . .

Who could have thought to make so many conceptions, so many thoughts, so many ideas, so many meanings—and so few words about what these sensory experiences were all about?

By now, everyone has much to think about, so our discussion might move off in many directions. But for the moment, I want to push it toward some of the older and newer theories about the processes called thinking, learning, and moving.

In the time of Plato and Aristotle, and for many centuries thereafter, all thinkers thought that the so-called mental processes, the so-called sensory processes, and the processes of bodily action were implemented by three more-or-less discrete circuits. And within the context of this three-part system, they thought that each set of processes dealt with its own kind of data.

Thus, they thought the mental circuits processed abstract essences and verbally structured kinds of knowledge, while the sensory circuits processed perceptually structured data, and the motor circuits (or the psychomotor circuits) processed neurally structured impulses. So for many centuries, virtually all thinkers thought of thinking as a verbally structured mental process, while they thought of the processes called sensing, feeling, seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling as perceptually structured sensory processes. And they assumed that the neurally structured psychomotor processes worked more-or-less automatically in ways that were susceptible to a process called conditioning.

Within the context of these assumptions, Plato's Academy was dedicated to the process of learning to *think* about verbally structured ideas, and as we all know, the perceptually structured arts and neurally structured athletic activities were excluded from the academic curriculum. Every educational theorist who followed after Plato made these same academic distinctions among verbally structured, perceptually structured, and neurally structured behaviors.

Then during the later years of the 19th century, a few philosophers, scientists, and educational theorists dared to disagree with Plato. In time they succeeded in their attempt to bring the mental circuit, the sensory circuit, and the psychomotor circuit together in one comprehensive conception of a neurally structured system which might implement *all* the processes of human intelligence.

And gradually, new questions appeared in the literature of education:

Are all kinds of learning neurally structured?
Are all kinds of learning perceptually structured?
What about verbally structured learning?
How does "learning to say" differ from "learning to see"?
And what about "learning to move" and "moving to learn"?

In the light of such questions, educational theorists began to propose new theories about the processes of learning. Now we have a disorderly array of such theories, and new ones are being proposed in virtually every issue of our educational publications.

A few months ago, I tried to put my own understanding of the sense of many of these newer theories into a few words that might be meaningful to a child. The first part deals with the question, How do children experience the process of learning in a classroom?

I sit in the classroom
  looking at what I see
  listening to what I hear
  sensing what I touch, taste, smell, and feel
  relating what I see and hear and sense and feel to
    what I know or think I know about
    what I know or think or feel about
    what I know or think or feel.
This is how I learn in the classroom.

Then, How do children experience the process of learning in a gymnasium or on a playground?

I move in the gymnasium, on the playground.
  Are my eyes blinded by movement?
  Are my ears silenced by play?
  Does action dull the sense of what I sense and feel and think?

Moving in the gymnasium, on the playground,
  I look at what I see
  I listen to what I hear
  I sense what I touch, taste, smell, and feel
  I relate what I see and hear and sense and feel to
    what I know or think I know about
    what I know or think or feel about
    what I know or think or feel.

This is how I learn in the classroom.
This is how I learn in the gymnasium, on the playground.

In part, the verbal structure of this more-or-less poetic statement was suggested by a poem about "what we know in what we see, what we feel in what we hear"—a poem composed by Wallace Stevens. So perhaps I should give you a little more of that poem now. In part, it goes like this:

What we know in what we see
What we feel in what we hear
What we are . . .
And what we think . . .

A breathing like the wind . . .
A moving part of motion . . .
A change part of change . . .
A discovery . . . part of a discovery. . . .

Too much like thinking to be less than thought.

Yes, I think Wallace Stevens would have understood what is happening in the life of a basketball player during any basketball game. So we might explore our own understanding of these happenings by trying to recall a particular moment in a particular basketball game. Or, if you prefer, recall a moment of tennis, a moment on the ski slopes, or a moment of dodgeball.

Begin by focusing your attention on "what you know in what you see" as your mental eye races around the gymnasium space . . . the walls . . . the floor . . . the surfaces . . . the markings on those surfaces. Visualize all of the playing area—the markings, the uprights, the suspended baskets—and all the relations among these material objects. Can you visualize all these complex relations in one quick glance? Does what you see make sense to you?

Now visualize 10 people moving about in relation to these spatially defined areas, surfaces, and materials. Do their movements make sense to you? How are these complex movements related to the spatial markers, to the rules of the game, and to you as you receive the ball?

Now let your mental ear pick up the murmur or shouts of many voices . . . the shrill blast of a whistle . . . the soft slap of running feet . . . the tattoo of ball on hardwood. Add the smell of sweat and leather . . . the salt taste in your mouth . . . the dryness in your throat. Recall the feel of the ball in your hands . . . the feel of sweat on your skin . . . the feeling of tension in your contracting muscles . . . the feelings of excitement or fear or confidence . . . or whatever feelings are churning about within the depths of your being.

Now try to put it all together in one complex recollection of everything you were seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, smelling, feeling, and thinking in that split second between receiving the ball and getting rid of it. Add an estimate of your own strength, your own skills, your own abilities . . . and an estimate of the strengths, skills, and abilities of your teammates and your opponents. Put it all together . . . everything you know or think you know about the game of basketball . . . everything you know or sense or feel about the immediate sensation . . . everything you know or sense or feel about yourself and nine other players. Put it all together . . . consider and weigh the alternatives . . . decide what you will try to do . . . act out that decision . . . and then move into position for the next play . . . all in one split second . . . all without saying a word.

Do you experience yourself as being "all brawn and no brain" in that split second? Or are you doing some of the most intensive thinking any human being can do . . . all in one split second . . . all without thinking about verbally structured words? Can you apply your understanding of this perceptually structured and neurally structured movement experience to all so-called movement experiences?

Here, we might try to conceptualize a situation in which 24 children are moving about in a gymnasium or on a playground, performing the actions of a game called skip tag. Can you visualize the spatial setting? The shape of the gymnasium? The colors and textures of the gymnasium space? The markings on the floor? The stationary equipment? The relations among the walls, floor, markings, and equipment? Can you recall the odor that permeates the gymnasium space? And all of the other sensory artifacts you associate with gymnasiums or playgrounds?

Where is the teacher? What do you know about her? And the children? What are they doing? What movements are they performing? What might they be sensing, knowing, feeling, perceiving, cognizing, conceptualizing, cogitating about, and learning within the context of this movement experience?

At first glance, it is apparent that the children's bodies are moving. Or we might say the children are exercising their bodies.

At second glance, it is apparent that they are not moving aimlessly. Rather, they are attempting to perform a structured or patterned set of movements, which we recognize as a skip. Or we might say the children are performing a dynamic pattern created by moving various body segments in preconceived ways in relation to a preconceived rhythm, suggested by the words "hippity-hoppity-hippity-hoppity."

At third glance, we see that they are performing these hippity-hoppity movements within the context of a spatially structured situation, which might be described this way: The children have arranged themselves in circles, seven children to a circle and one child outside the circle. The outside child hippity-hoppities around the circle in a clockwise direction and eventually touches the back of one of the children in the circle. Then he continues his hippity-hopping in a clockwise direction, while the touched child hippity-hops around the circle in the opposite or counterclockwise direction. The child who first reaches the space vacated by the touched child claims that space. And the other child then hippity-hops around the circle, in a clockwise direction, touches another child, and so on.

As we think about these children who are exercising their bodies by skipping about in a game or contest within the context of a playing space, we might ask many questions about what is happening in the life of each child. We might ask the questions of anatomy and physiology. What is happening in each child's muscles, in his lungs, in his heart, arteries, and veins? Surely all physical education teachers have asked these questions many times.

We might ask the questions of neurophysiology. What is happening in the neurophysiological mechanisms that implement each child's ability to move, to know, to sense, to feel, to perceive, to cognize, to conceptualize, to learn? Surely every physical education teacher—and every teacher—is grateful to the scientists who are trying to find answers to these questions.

Or we might ask the questions of human experience. What is each child experiencing, knowing, sensing, feeling, perceiving, cognizing, conceptualizing, thinking, and learning during these brief moments of exercising his body by hippity-hopping about a gymnasium within the context of a game called skip tag? And how is he relating what he knows, senses, feels, perceives, and cognizes to what he knows or thinks he knows about what he knows or thinks or feels about what he knows or thinks or feels?

Yes. To move, to know, to see, to hear, to touch, to taste, to smell, to feel, to relate, to conceptualize, to learn—that is what a movement experience *is*

And out of what one child experiences as he hippity-hoppities around in a circle, in a gymnasium, within the context of a game situation, who could have thought to make so many conceptions of what a movement experience is all about? Or I might say. Yes, I think that every movement experience is "too much like thinking to be less than thought"—and I think that the thoughts of moving children are well worth thinking about.

III

Sport and Dance

Competition and Education (1957)

One of the most fundamental things we physical educators do is promote and encourage competition. Two-thirds or more of the program we teach is related to sports and games that involve contest between persons or between persons and impersonal elements of time, space, and gravity. The most basic meaning of these contests is derived from the essential act of competing against another person or impersonal elements. We have devised an incredible variety of situations that incorporate this concept of competition. What do they all have in common?

Roger Bannister put it this way: "Sport is a diversion with no other purpose than to provide a testing ground larger than a chessboard but smaller than life itself." Sports provide diversion, a change of interest, involvement in something different from our daily occupations and preoccupations, something that involves movement, a change for body as well as mind. Sports provide a testing ground upon which we may try ourselves out, find out what we can do and therefore what we are, and find out how we react when opposed by some resisting force. Sports are larger than a chessboard. The whole person is involved—not only his mind but his ego, his muscles, nerves, blood vessels, heart, his very life blood, his endocrine glands, his liver, his lungs, and his digestive tract. But sport is smaller than life itself. The objectives are defined in specific terms (e.g., number of baskets) that have no meaning apart from the situation. Sport is confined to a limited space within a limited time. Definite rules have been agreed on; and essentially, the outcome has no drastic effect on

---

Delivered at the annual convention, Southern District AHPER, Physical Education Division, Jacksonville, Fla., 1957.

our lives. Sports provide a neat, clean situation with no loose ends. We know when it begins. We know what is required. We know when it ends.

Sports competition is different from all other forms of human competition for survival, status, advancement, job, or competition of two members of one sex for a member of the opposite sex. It is a contest openly declared in which the contest itself is the reason for our being in the situation. It is a contest in which we cooperate with each other for the purpose of pitting ourselves against each other with no quarter given or asked, making our best effort to win by using all our resources within agreed-upon rules, recognizing openly that to do less than our best is to "throw the game" and make a mockery of it. This competition in sports is, in essence, an expression of friendship, mutuality, goodwill, in which we pay each other the high compliment of offering each other our best opposition to provide for ourselves and the other the satisfaction found in striving to do one's best.

What is the meaning of this striving? The meaning of all human experience. As Richard Wilbur says, "What is our praise of pride but to imagine excellence and try to make it?" In the early Greek games the significance of striving was epitomized by the laurel wreath of the victor. In the games, men honored their gods by offering their best performances to them. And their belief that the significance of these performances was in the striving of the moment, in using oneself fully moment by moment, was symbolized by the laurel wreath which withered within the hour. For when the games were over, it no longer mattered who had won or lost. It was time for all men to move on to the next experiences of their lives. Later, the laurel wreath was replaced by tangible rewards, and the Greek games became the province of professional athletes.

I think we can assume that all of us agree that potentially there is no finer experience for any person than to test himself, to explore his own abilities, to find out what he can do and therefore what he is, by accepting the challenge of another person or his impersonal environment and to meet it to the best of his ability at that moment, even though the odds may be against him. Our discussions and arguments about competition are seldom centered on that point. Our arguments arise from our inability or unwillingness to make a clear distinction between the intrinsic values inherent in this situation for the competitor and the extrinsic values that may be attached to it in the form of other rewards or satisfactions.

For the competitor, the intrinsic value of competition is found in the act of competing—the striving, the doing, the satisfaction of using himself fully within the limits of the situation. Why might you challenge me to a tennis game on a hot summer afternoon? For the satisfaction we would both find in extending ourselves to use our abilities fully against competition. The outcome of the game would have no significance beyond that moment. Our satisfaction would come from playing the game moment by moment. This is the essence of the concept of amateur competition—in which an amateur is defined as one who plays for the satisfaction he finds in playing.

Competition also has many extrinsic values attached to it. For example, the declared professional who earns his living by competing is essentially a showman, an actor. Whether he derives personal satisfaction at the moment of the act of competing is of secondary consequence. The value attached to his performance is measured by the satisfaction he provides for the spectators. This is the essence of the concept of professional competition, in which professional is defined as one who plays for the satisfaction other people find in his performance.

Both amateur competition and professional competition are equally valid within their own frames of reference. Our confusion arises when we confuse these frames of reference and try to justify amateur competition in terms of extrinsic values or professional competition in terms of intrinsic values—that is, if we should try to justify our tennis game on the grounds that it provided satisfaction for the spectators, or if we should try to justify professional baseball on the grounds that it provided Joe DiMaggio with a diversion and a testing ground larger than a chess board but smaller than life itself.

At the extremes, our ability to distinguish between the intrinsic and extrinsic values is reasonably clear. Our confusion exists in the vast middle ground of competition in which significance is attached to both the intrinsic and the extrinsic values without making a clear distinction between them. Unless we can clarify our own thinking on this point, there is little likelihood that we, ourselves, shall make full use of the educational potential in competition or that we shall materially affect the thinking of noneducational groups promoting competition outside the confines of educational institutions.

One or two examples will make this point clear. It is obvious that the elaborate structure of intercollegiate competition is maintained by institutions of higher learning for purposes other than providing an educational experience for some fifty men who have been brought to the institution primarily for that purpose. Why, then, must we pretend that this is not true? Why must the coach, faculty, and administrative officers of the institution try to maintain the fiction that intercollegiate athletics is justified by the experiences it provides for the players? Why do sports writers wax eloquent about "what football did for Joe" in lambasting the university officials for tampering with "the system" which is the issue in the Pacific Coast League mess? Certainly his athletic experience "did something for Joe," but is this the real reason for maintaining the elaborate structure of intercollegiate athletics? Why are we afraid to face the facts of our own actions and openly acknowledge that in intercollegiate athletics the extrinsic values far outweigh the intrinsic values for the competitors?

A community near Los Angeles has recently built a beautiful ballpark for Little League games. The money was raised on a plea of "doing something for the boys." But what are the facts? Less than 5 percent of the boys in that community will ever set foot on the turf of that ballpark. Most of the money was spent for concrete bleachers, electric score board, loudspeaker system, and overhead lights to permit evening play involving in all less than 150 boys between the ages of 8 and 12. Obviously the intrinsic values of the competitive experience provided for 150 boys are far outweighed by the extrinsic values attached to this competition. In their own frame of reference, many of these extrinsic values are valid ones. Why, then, are the promoters afraid to face the facts and openly acknowledge that in Little League (or other similar forms of competition) the extrinsic values attached to it far outweigh the intrinsic values inherent in the experience for the boys involved?

But let him who is without sin among us cast the first stone. We are equally naive if we do not clearly recognize that within our own educationally sponsored programs the laurel wreaths do not always wither within the hour. And this applies equally to women and men, although our evasions may at times take somewhat different forms.

We, too, provide much vicarious satisfaction through identification with athletic teams, obviously at the level of interscholastic competition, perhaps less obviously at the level of intramural competition or squad competition within a physical education class. We, too, reward the successful players for providing this vicarious satisfaction by giving them tangible rewards or symbolic ones, including special privileges and exemption from rules and requirements. We, too, use satisfaction of the coach's ego as a justifiable motivation for many practices that are unrelated to the intrinsic value of the experience for the players.

We, too, may turn play into display, for many reasons, some valid in themselves, others more dubious. We make a performance of competition to raise money, to inform parents about our programs, to elicit interest in the schools, or to satisfy our own egos.

In our games, too, the game itself may become less important than the symbolic significance attached to it either by those of us who teach or by the players themselves. Ulrich's study and others have shown that the interpretation of a competitive experience is far more significant than the experience itself in eliciting symptoms of stress. Johnson's study showed that urging and exhorting boys to put out more effort in an attempt to surpass their competitors affected different boys quite differently. Those who had been successful in the past were able to put out more effort and obtain better results. Those who had been less successful and were anxious about their own ability put out more effort but got less results and eventually became nauseated from their inability to resolve their conflict within themselves.

A volleyball game may become a grudge fight, in which hostility is expressed in the form of desire to beat the other players and thus humiliate them while exalting one's own status. The superior may find exaltation in defeating the inferior as a measure of their own power to dominate. The inferior may find in defeat new doubts about their own personal worth as human beings. A game of kickball in the fourth grade may be for the show-off an opportunity for showing off, for the aggressor an opportunity for aggression, and for the submissive an experience that underlines his insecurity and makes him more dependent. All these values may far outweigh the intrinsic value we assign to the competitive experience, as such.

But let me repeat, there is nothing in what I have said that implies that intrinsic values are good and extrinsic values are bad. Both may be valid in their own frames of reference. My only plea is for forthright recognition of these different values so that both our actions and our arguments may be honest rather than hypocritical.

Confusion of values is widespread in every area of life. But as educators, our first job is to put our own house in order by examining our own value systems, identifying our own intrinsic and extrinsic values for what they are in their own frames of reference. Until we do this, we have no valid basis for saying what is "good" or what is "bad."

T. S. Eliot has described "the greatest treason" as "doing the right deed for the wrong reason." At the present time, we as educators are often, both wittingly and unwittingly, guilty of this greatest treason. And until we can face our own culpability squarely, we shall continue to dissipate our energy in the futility of angry arguments with the wrong people about the wrong questions.

For example, to attempt to persuade the promoters of Little League baseball that their program is wrong because baseball is potentially dangerous for little boys is ridiculous. What basis do we have for taking such a stand when we, ourselves, teach little boys to play baseball or a reasonable facsimile thereof? Our attempts to avoid incriminating ourselves by avoiding the facts has led to self-deception and attempts to deceive on both sides. What are some of the facts? The activity of baseball, itself, is not materially different when played in a ballpark or on a playground. The differences in equipment and rules are only a minor part of our argument. In the ballpark, the game is probably better played because the boys have had more practice and exhibit greater skill. There is evidence that the boys in the ballpark are those most fit for this activity. They are the early maturers and as such are taller, heavier, generally better adjusted in school, further advanced toward physiological maturity, and they have correspondingly greater capacity for performance. Hale's study of pubescence status of Little League players shows that this relation between physiological maturity and success in league play is so close that it extends even to the positions played. There is some evidence that the accident per child-hour of exposure is slightly higher in the ballpark, which may well be related to the fact that the children participate more intensively in the activity during the time they are there. In terms of symptoms of stress objectively and quantitatively measured, Skubic's study showed that quantitatively greater symptoms of stress were elicited in a physical education class than by a Little League game. Ulrich's study on college women showed, interestingly enough, that greater quantitative symptoms of stress were elicited by a written examination in the classroom than by participation in a highly competitive basketball game. As to the qualitative differences in emotion, we have almost no objective evidence; all our conclusions are drawn from citations of isolated cases and can be opposed by other cases that deny the conclusions.

The real basis of our differences with the noneducational promoters of competition rests upon differences of opinion about values. Educators believe that the values derived from competitive experience are related to the developmental pattern of physical, mental, and emotional growth in children. They believe that during the pre-adolescent years, children derive the greatest value from exposure to a variety of competitive experiences rather than from intensive concentration on one such experience. In short, they believe that too early exposure to certain competitive experiences that may be valid for adults is, in the long run, harmful to the total development of children. In contrast, the noneducational promoters, including many parents, believe that children benefit from the earliest possible exposure to adult competitive experiences.

So long as we fail to recognize that this basic difference of belief in what constitutes value for children exists, we are wasting our breath and ruining our blood pressure by arguing about details. So long as we fail to recognize that we are at issue over basic values in an area in which many of our own beliefs and values may be equally open to question, I do not believe that we can be constructive in our attempts to resolve many of the issues related to competition, either in or out of school.

In this context, then, we shall now turn to our panel members and raise three general questions about athletic competition:

1. What is the essential nature of our contribution as educators, and how can we make that contribution most effectively?

2. How can we best develop programs that embody our own honest beliefs, clearly stated and continually re-examined?

3. How can we channel public interest and money now going into highly publicized programs for the few into better programs for the many?

Will We Save Our Tennis Courts? (1958)

As we have related our discussions to the theme "Let's Communicate," many good ideas have been presented, but perhaps the two most emphasized have been these: Communication begins when the listener makes a response; and the listener responds only when what is being said is of specific interest to him at the time and under the circumstances in which the attempt at communication is made. My assignment tonight is to re-emphasize these two points.

My own awareness of these axioms of effective communication was sharpened on the night of November 4 as I watched television to get the early election returns. Inevitably I was exposed to much high-priced commercial communication from the various manufacturers who had paid for the presentation of the election information I wanted to hear. Perhaps it wasn't fair of me to ignore my benefactors, but being human, I did what all human beings do. I listened only to what interested me—the election returns. I did not turn off the commercials; I let them impinge on my eyes and my ears; but to me they were only sound and fury, signifying nothing. No communication occurred because I was not listening to the words; and I was not listening to the words because I did not really want to "fight nicotine, fast, fast, fast and move up to quality by thinking for myself for the first time in my life so I could be really clean by removing the ingredients three out of four doctors recommended from the recessed filter in my living bra—which was just a little better than any other aspirin happened to be." (And the election returns "didn't upset my stomick [sic] either!")

Delivered at the annual conference, Western Society for Physical Education of College Women, Asilomar-Pacific Grove, Calif., 1958.

My inattention and failure to respond must not be interpreted as criticism of the commercial communicators. They are very good at their chosen occupation. They learned to answer the communications questions of "Why? What? Who? When? and Where?" long ago. Their communication is very effective in reaching the audience they are trying to reach—the 12-year-old minds in a mass audience that do respond to fake proofs and men in white coats who promise magic solutions to all human problems. But their communication does not reach me because I, like you, belong in the high-IQ bracket that includes people whose minds are trained to know there are no magic answers to the complicated problems inherent in our human situation.

As I sat musing about these things, my own subliminal perceptions gradually came into focus and I saw the audience *we* must try to reach—a high-IQ audience that is not impressed when earrings are dropped into wet cleaning tissues on the television screen. This audience was assembled in an auditorium on a college campus; it included members of the legislature, the board of regents or trustees, the college administrators, and every member of the college faculty.

Displayed on the stage were three large charts. One was a map of the campus with each square of space marked "so many s/sf," meaning students per square foot. The second was a list of all the courses in the college curriculum, each labelled "c/sui," meaning cost per student unit of instruction. The third was a list of "the phe/pmh," meaning the purposes of higher education in our present moment of history.

The president was speaking: "Something has to give. The college must stop every leak. All nonessentials must be eliminated. Every square foot of space and every penny of budget must be used with maximum effectiveness to achieve the purposes of higher education for the ever-increasing number of students now enrolling in college. I have, therefore, called you all together to help me solve these problems. I am asking you to serve as a great tribunal before which each department may plead its case; and when you have heard all departments justify their contributions to the purposes of higher education in relation to the time, space, money, and personnel required to produce those contributions, you will vote to determine what must be saved and what can be dispensed with in relation to the interests of college as a whole."

I looked around the auditorium and saw the faculty sitting in departmental groups. The scientists looked bold and self-confident. They were assured of every consideration in this emerging age of space. In fact, they were already studying the blueprints for an atom-smasher that would fit nicely on the women's tennis courts.

The professional schools of engineering, law, medicine, and commerce showed by their demeanor that they knew they were needed to help build bigger rockets, to settle men's squabbles, to patch up the wrecks civilization would continue to make of men's lives, and to keep the economy running to pay for that civilization. The school of education looked less assured. They would probably lose some courses, but they knew they would survive. After all, children do have to be taught by someone.

The humanities were smugly self-conscious of their own traditional virtues. "Everyone knows an educated man should be familiar with the ideas of the past," they muttered; but they seemed a bit uneasy as they added defensively, "And we don't take up much space, you know. We can crowd hundreds of students into one classroom—and all we require is a few books."

The modern languages were jostling each other for a place under the banner "One World—Communication." French and Spanish and German were being crowded by Russian and Chinese, while men with brown skins who spoke Hindustani and Swahili tried to move from the edge to the center of the group. But not one of the linguists had raised a finger in defense of poor, old classical languages who, by virtue of seniority, had been the first to plead his case. He was now being led weeping from the auditorium to a cell in the basement of the law school, condemned to spend his days compiling glossaries of the Latin phrases that make up the archaic jargon of law and medicine. As the students learned these phrases by rote, the first one would be *amicus curiae*—friend of the court—but in his time of need the Latin professor had found no friends in the great courtroom. No one disliked him; they just didn't know him. He had lived in the past so completely that no one had ever seen him in the faculty dining room or at faculty senate meetings. He had never been interested in the rest of the faculty and their present-day problems, and no one felt impelled to try to save him now.

The men's physical education faculty was sitting with the coaching staff from the department of athletics. They seemed slightly elevated above the rest of the faculty because they were sitting on money bags. Their banner read, "You Can't Touch Us! We Make Money!" (This is not necessarily true, as a few money-conscious administrators have begun to find out, but it is generally believed to be true, which is often just as effective.) The reverse side of their banner read, "Remember the Alumni!"

The men did not even glance in the direction of the women's physical education department, which was separated from them by the width of the auditorium. Why should they? They did not identify themselves with the women. In fact, they scarcely knew them. Occasionally the director of athletics (who was also chairman of the division of physical education) had to meet with the head of the women's department, but it always turned into a hassle, with the woman making outrageous demands and getting angry when her demands were refused. Who cared about women's physical education? They had no athletic teams, and it was said that they were just plain opposed to competition. They spent money like water, but never a cent did they *earn* for the college. (These same thoughts were passing through the bursar's mind as he mentally totalled up the requisitions for equipment, clothing, towels—and that laundry bill! Why the total budget for classical languages had been less than the laundry bill from the women's department of physical education.)

As the head of the women's department of physical education walked forward, she was clearly on the defensive. You could see it in the set of her shoulders and the thin line of her mouth. How many friends did *she* have at court? How much communicating had she done—in the real sense of the word, which means "to make common" by sharing with all? Who felt disposed to listen to her because she had often listened to him? Who was potentially interested in her problems because she had been interested in his? Who identified her as a co-worker who had shared his concern for the larger problems of the college? Who was ready to trust her implicitly because she had so often demonstrated that her intellectual integrity was greater than her self-interest?

I thought of an election that had just been lost by a margin of less than one vote out of every 500 cast. I knew that in a close fight one friend may be the margin between victory and defeat.

My head began to ache as I watched this scene on my mental television screen. But it is significant that I did not reach for one of the much-advertised products that turn off hammers and lightning in square holes in the head or open trap doors in the stomach. Instead I reached for my bottle of pharmaceutical aspirin, which costs 22 cents per hundred, including tax. It contains no magic ingredients; it is only a simple compound of the drugs that all doctors recognize as useful in dulling pain for short periods of time. The public relations budget of this pharmaceutical house is a modest one, but they sell their aspirin year after year because they offer good value in proportion to the cost of a product that satisfies a basic human need.

You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool a hard-pressed college faculty when the heat is on. When we stand before that high-IQ-bracket college tribunal, good public relations will help—and may actually be the critical factor if the vote is close—but public relations alone will not save either our requirements or our tennis courts. We shall not be dealing with 12-year-old minds that can be manipulated by false promises. We shall be dealing with colleagues who are just as smart as we are—and just as ambivalent when faced with choices between self-interest and the interests of the college as a whole.

The question we must be prepared to answer honestly and fully is, "Why should our tennis courts be saved?" Why should we be permitted to retain acres of valuable land that might accommodate classrooms, laboratories, dormitories, or faculty automobiles? What do we produce that has value proportional to the cost of space, facilities, time, and personnel?

This is not the time for mouthing educational clichés. This is the time for some real, honest, professional soul-searching. Why *is* a tennis court? What *happens* on a tennis court that is important? What is produced on a tennis court that cannot equally well be produced elsewhere on campus in other facilities? What vital educational *need* does this educational product satisfy? Is that need *important* enough to justify allotting valuable land to tennis courts?

(At this point it may be appropriate to have the operator flash a statement on the screen reading, "The opinions of the speaker are her own. They do not necessarily represent the opinions of the program sponsor.")

In my opinion—and I shall continue to argue on these grounds until they drag me away kicking and screaming to the small gymnasium where hordes of girls are huddled together doing exercises to make them physically fit—the unique purpose of physical education for college women (and college men, too) is to enable them to move in a variety of ways, for a variety of reasons, to produce a variety of immediate and long-term satisfactions that will be meaningful in their lives. I believe our physical education classes exist to facilitate that learning process. Girls can learn to move only by moving, and they need space in which to move. I believe we can justify their need for that space by demonstrating that during and after her hour on the tennis court a girl gets more meaningful satisfactions from moving.

Of course, there is much more to physical education than that. Much else can and does happen to girls on a tennis court. They get fresh air and sunshine. They meet boys. They experiment in a laboratory of human relationships. They get experience in competition, leadership, followership, ball-chasership. They find out what it means to belong in a group and to adjust to others in a group. They may improve in sportsmanship, character development, learning by doing, citizenship, and so on through the long list of objectives we cite for physical education. But right now we are talking about tennis courts, and there is no objective on that list that cannot be achieved somewhere else on campus in a much smaller space.

If we really get down to the facts about the unique value of tennis courts, if we concern ourselves with developing genuine communication based on genuine experience, if we refuse to rely on shopworn clichés, pat answers, and magic words, we shall be forced to recognize that there is only one thing you can do on a tennis court that you cannot do equally well somewhere else—you can play tennis. On a tennis court, and only on a tennis court, you can move in the specific ways that result in playing a game called tennis.

I believe it is on this point that we must finally stand or fall. If we believe that moving in the specific ways that result in playing a game called tennis is important enough to justify the cost of tennis courts, then we have valid reasons for trying to save our tennis courts. And when we are certain of the basis for our own beliefs we shall be much better able to communicate them to others as we face the crucial, practical question: Does it *matter to our colleagues* whether college girls learn to move in ways that result in playing a game called tennis?

Last week I heard a lecturer quote Karl Marx's statement, "Life is motions of matter." But the friend sitting next to me wrote in her notes a much more profound statement: "Life is motions *that* matter." And she was right. The wonder of being human is that we have the ability to make motions that do matter—human motions that are meaningful to human beings. For this is the distinction between the words *motion* and *movement;* human movement is motion that matters to a human being. "Going through the motions" is not physical education or any other kind of education, because education results only from meaningful experiences that really matter to the learner.

As all educational disciplines stand before the college tribunal, this is the criterion by which they will all be judged. Does this experience really matter? Is it meaningful to college students in this present moment of history? And the deciding votes will be cast in favor of those educational experiences that our colleagues value most highly because they matter the most and are therefore the most meaningful.

Yes, we do need to develop better techniques for communicating with our colleagues, but these techniques will be truly effective only if what we are communicating is meaningful to them. As we attempt to sort out our own thinking in this time of crisis, I believe we shall learn much about the meaningfulness of the movements we call physical education, and in the process we shall begin to understand more clearly why they do matter so much to us.

I believe we shall discover that it is not motions that produce physical fitness but meaningful movements that matter to the individual. Fitness comes from voluntary movement carried on throughout a lifetime, movement carried past the point of mild fatigue—and people continue to move past the point of mild fatigue only if the motions they are performing are meaningful to them. All of us know this from our own experiences of pushing ourselves past the point of mild fatigue by continuing to hit tennis balls while the perspiration poured from our skins, by walking after golf balls long after our legs had begun to protest, by leaping and falling in the dance studio long after our muscles had begun to ache. Why have we done this? Not to get physically fit. We did it because the movements we were doing mattered to us in some meaningful way, and physical fitness resulted from our voluntary perseverance in continuing those movements past the point of mild fatigue.

I believe we shall discover that our psychological objectives are not achieved by motions but by the performance of movements that matter to the person performing them. An idiot child in China may sit all day transferring a feather from one molasses-smeared hand to the other; he is continually in motion but nothing *happens* to him because the motions he performs are meaningless. It is only when movements matter—as they can matter in playing tennis—that girls learn by doing, and the experiences of winning and losing, exerting self-control, and learning strategy in relation to the strengths, weaknesses, and rights of others have an impact on their lives and subsequent behavior.

I believe we shall discover that the values of group interaction are not derived from going through motions together. Putting 10 college girls in a circle and having them transfer feathers from one hand to the other would produce no vital interactions among them, because the activity in which they were engaged would be meaningless to them. It is only when the movements that we perform when we are together matter that the group interactions become consequential in our lives. In short, I believe we shall discover that our manifold physical, psychological, and social objectives are meaningful only to the extent that tennis, as such, matters as a meaningful form of human activity that involves human movement.

Will we save our tennis courts? I do not know. But I do know that there are three kinds of people in the world: those who make things happen; those who watch things happen; and those who don't know what's going on. I believe that the members of the Western Society are smart enough to get out on their own campuses and find out what's going on in the high-IQ bracket. I believe we are honest enough to go to the heart of the question: *Why* should our tennis courts be saved? And when we are certain of our own answers, I believe we will be able to communicate those answers to the right people at the right time in the right place in the right way by talking about values that satisfy basic human needs at a cost proportional to their intrinsic worth.

My faith in our ultimate success is strengthened by remembering that David had only a slingshot and a pebble when he faced Goliath. But David was too smart to waste time wailing about his terrible fix. Instead he used his skill to aim his pebble straight at a vital point. And because he had no doubts about what he was doing, why he was doing it, who was at the receiving end, and when and where he had to score a hit, he slew Goliath. As we face our own Goliath we are armed only with a tennis racquet and a ball, but like David we have our own skills. If, like David, we can also find the right answers to the questions that determine the effectiveness of all communication—Why? What? Who? When? Where?—then I believe we can make our tennis racquet serve.

Sport and the Feminine Image (1964)

The issues debated in this paper have a long history. They were raised as early as 776 B.C. by the custom of excluding women from the sacred precincts of Olympia. They were raised in 1896 when women were admitted to competition in some events in the modern Olympic Games but excluded from others. They are being argued around the world today as every national Olympic committee makes its own decisions about the inclusion of women in the lists of competitors. This paper is not an attempt to resolve all of these long-standing issues; rather it is an attempt to inquire into the underlying nature of these controversies.

In an earlier paper—"Symbolic Forms of Movement: The Olympic Games"—I interpreted the Olympic events as symbolic formulations of man's conception of himself as a consequential force within the universe of space, time, mass, and energy. In the present paper I shall pursue that interpretation with reference to some conceptions of roles appropriate for women.

At the biological level, arguments about appropriate roles for men and women must be pursued in terms of differences in anatomical structure and function. These sexually significant differences are too well known to need explication here. With reference to sports competition the important question is, How are these differences related to the ability to overcome the inertia of mass?

Delivered at the International Olympic Academy, Fourth Session, Olympia, Greece, 1964.

In terms of averages, men are larger and stronger than women. But this generalization does not hold for individual representatives of the two sexes. Some women may be very large and strong, and their ability to overcome the inertia of mass may be far greater than that of the majority of men. Similarly, some men may be smaller and less muscular than many women, and in any contest with the inertia of mass they make a very poor showing—and may, in fact, be bested by the majority of the opposite sex.

To some extent these relationships may be modified by pregnancy, the demands of infant care, and possibly menstruation; and all of these episodes may serve to limit a woman's interest in the kind of training men may undergo in preparation for international competition. But they do not vitiate the biological fact that women appear to be fully competent to engage in a contest with the inertia of mass. In terms of averages, women's achievements may be less spectacular than those of men; in terms of individual achievement, some women may well surpass most of the male competitors in any athletic event. Thus, the age-old arguments about whether women should be admitted to competition in the Olympic events cannot be pursued in meaningful terms at the strictly biological level of anatomical structure and function.

In every culture, men and women play different roles within the social organization. In part, these roles are defined by the relative contribution each sex makes to the reproduction of the species—a biologically determined contribution which is the same in all cultures. But in larger terms, these roles are established by some less-well-defined set of factors not directly related to these biological differences, as evidenced by the fact that they differ from culture to culture. This complex of factors serves to determine the *masculine image* of behaviors appropriate to males and the corresponding *feminine image* of behaviors appropriate to females in each social group.

At the time of the early Olympic Festivals, which date back beyond the first recorded games of 776 B.C., the images of masculinity and femininity within the emerging culture of ancient Greece were clearly delineated. These early Greeks envisioned their gods as persons very like themselves, differing from human beings only in the extent of their personal powers over the natural forces of the universe. Thus, they assigned to their male gods all the behaviors appropriate to their own image of supermasculinity, while the behaviors of superfemininity were assigned to the female goddesses. A brief review of the characteristics of these gods and goddesses may give us some insight into the reasons women were excluded from the sacred precincts of Olympia.

Among the male gods, Zeus, the hurler of thunderbolts, had dominion over all the forces of earth; and his messenger, Hermes, could overcome both space and time with winged feet. Poseidon, the earth-shaker, had dominion over the forces of the sea. Ares, the god of war, was a powerful destructive force; and Hephaestus, the god of the metal workers, could subdue the materials of earth with one powerful blow of his hammer and shape them into forms of his own choosing. Even Apollo, who epitomized the intellectual powers of reason and logic, was pictured as an athlete, well able to overcome the forces of earth by skillful use of his bodily strength as well as by his intellectual prowess.

What an Olympic team the gods would have been! How they would have excelled in every contest in the early Olympic Festivals! And it may be noted that the Olympic Games in which men strove to overcome the forces of the earth in symbolic contests were held in honor of Zeus, the all-powerful father of the gods.

In contrast, the image projected by the female goddesses is almost totally devoid of any suggestion of physical strength that might be used to overcome the forces of earth—or of men. Demeter, the Earth Mother, is envisioned as the ground in which all life is bred and nutured. Hera, the wife of Zeus, is pictured as his helpmate, whose own will must ever be subordinated to the desires of her husband. (It may be noted, however, that Hera is never wholly resigned to this role, and at times she uses her own female resources to seduce Zeus into doing her will rather than his.) Aphrodite, born of the foam of the sea, has none of these homely virtues. She is the goddess of beauty, infinitely desirable to all men. But if she delights in arousing their sexual desires, she can also be cruel and treacherous. In return for her favors, she demands tribute from her admirers, and men may well be fearful of her vengeance when her need for adoration is not satisfied. We are told that she was an accomplished swimmer, but she appears to have used this skill largely to display her lovely body in attractive poses that lured men to their destruction.

The fact that the early Greeks could not reconcile feminine desirability with athletic prowess is underlined in the legends of Artemis and Athena. Artemis, the beautiful goddess of the hunt, was fleet of foot, and none excelled her in the use of bow and arrow—but men did not find her lovely body desirable. Perhaps it was the other way around. At any rate, legend relates that Artemis and her followers rejected the love of men and found delight in the companionship of women. Athena, goddess of wisdom, and of all goddesses the most respected, carried her own spear as she led men into battle, and her most famous statue shows her in full fighting array. But, alas, she too was denied the love of men, her perpetual virginity being commemorated in the Temple of the Maiden called the Parthenon.

Perhaps Artemis might have entered the foot races in the earliest games at Olympia; perhaps Athena might have thrown the javelin as well as the spear. In fact there were some limited competitions of this type for maidens in some of the festivals attended by women. But even in Sparta, where young girls were encouraged to develop both strength and skill, marriage put an end to such competitive endeavors. For adult women, the virtues demanded were those of Demeter, Hera, and Aphrodite—and the strength, skill, and intellect of Athena and Artemis did not fit this image of feminine desirability.

These are the elements out of which the prototypes of masculinity and femininity were compounded by the early ancestors of Western civilization. But these images were never wholly static. As men learned increasingly to control the stuff of their universe with skill and intellect, rather than with sheer strength of muscle, the masculine image reflected this evolving interpretation of man's role as a consequential force within the grand design. So, too, the feminine image began to change—albeit much more slowly.

The shift from muscle to skill and intellect may be seen in the contrast between Heracles, the legendary hero of pre-Homeric Greece, and Theseus, the later hero who made Athens into the most powerful of all Greek cities. Heracles, who is sometimes credited with founding the earliest form of the Olympic Games, was a man of incredible strength. Certainly he would have been a formidable competitor in all of the early Olympic events, for no man exceeded him in size or strength of muscle. In all truth, however, he was not very bright, and his great strength led him into all sorts of trouble. He suffered great pangs of remorse for the damage caused by his own ineptitude, but he did not seem to learn much from these destructive episodes.

Theseus, who comes along much later in the story of Greece, presents quite a different picture. He is smaller than Heracles, and he has less strength, but he uses that strength with far greater skill and is more disposed to forethought than to remorse and vain regret. He is the first king to establish and maintain his right to rule largely by force of intellect, and in his story we find the first recognition of the virtues of cooperation among men and cities. Heracles might well have bested Theseus in the pancratium and other weight events in the Olympic arena, but Theseus would have excelled in any contest demanding skill and strategy in the use of the lighter implements and probably in the team games, which were later to demand cooperation as well as competition.

In the time of Heracles, the feminine image projected by Demeter, Hera, and Aphrodite was embodied in the legendary first woman, Pandora. She was lovely to behold, her name means "all joys," and she was welcomed as a helpmate—but, alas, she was really very stupid. Allowing her curiosity to overcome her caution, she opened the box that contained all the evils and sorrows of mankind and let them loose in the world, where they plague men to this day. But in her one display of good sense, she did slam the lid down just in time to preserve woman's greatest gift to man—the gift of hope.

In the picture of Pandora, there is little to suggest an interest in overcoming the inertia of mass. But Hippolyta, Queen of the Amazons, who won the enduring love of Theseus many centuries later, presents quite a different image. As ruler of her own kingdom, Hippolyta was the equal of Theseus in intelligence and skill, although smaller in size and of lesser strength. As they confronted each other in mortal combat at their first meeting, her courage matched his, and she fought bravely and well, neither asking nor offering advantage. In the eyes of Theseus she was both beautiful and desirable, and when he had won her he found new joy in the sexual embrace, for her ardor and skill matched his own. In marriage, she was a faithful helpmate and a devoted mother, and equally she was a good companion, both at home and in the hunt. In the end, she proved her love for Theseus by offering her life to save his, and it is said that he mourned her unceasingly for the rest of his days.

The legendary Hippolyta seems to have combined in her own person the skill and intellect of Artemis and Athena, the homely virtues of Demeter and Hera, and the beauty and desirability of Aphrodite. Surely, to Theseus, she was everything a man might hope to find in a woman. Had she been admitted to the lists of the Olympic Games, it is likely that she would have earned her laurels proudly—not in the pancratium or weight-events, perhaps, but surely in the foot races and the javelin throw. And it is likely that Theseus would have found pride in her achievements. But for the citizens of Athens, the time for recognition of such womanly feats had not yet come.

Hippolyta was cruelly rejected by the Athenians, both male and female. They could not reconcile intellect, skill, and strength with their image of adult female sexuality. In her own life, however, Hippolyta proved them wrong, and they never forgave her for this. To this day, her name evokes suspicion in the minds of many men and women. Nonetheless, she left her own bright legend for future generations, the legend of a woman far ahead of her time who won and held the love of the most eminent and far-seeing man among the citizens of early Athens.

The gods and goddesses of ancient Greek myth have long departed from their old home on Mount Olympus, but their images are still reflected in the connotations of the words *masculine* and *feminine* as we use them today. Historically, as men have moved forward on the path of skill and intellect pointed out by Theseus, they have tended to devalue the virtues of sheer muscular power—but the term *masculine* still suggests the image of Heracles. So, too, it is Pandora's image that is suggested by the term *feminine*. And many of the arguments about the appropriateness of sports competition for women hinge on those connotations.

However, when the modern Olympic Games were established in 1896, the image of Hippolyta was partially cleansed of the slurs that have tarnished it through the years, and women were at last permitted to seek their own laurels in some events. Today the image of the feminine athlete is still somewhat blurred, but its modern outlines seem to be emerging in currently sanctioned patterns of sports competition for women.

The socially sanctioned images of femininity and masculinity are always relative. They differ from era to era, from culture to culture, and from group to group within a given social organization. In broadest general terms, these socially sanctioned images may be described as a composite interpretation of what the members of either sex may be or do without impairing their opportunities for finding a mate within their own social classification.

The social sanctions indicated below were derived from attitudes expressed by college women in the United States. I am indebted to Laura Huelster of the University of Illinois and Mabel Hart of the University of Southern California for many of the data used here. They must not, however, be held responsible for my interpretation of their findings nor for the extension of these data to international level or Olympic competition.

1. At the international level, some forms of competition appear to be *categorically unacceptable*, as indicated by the fact that women are excluded from Olympic competition in these events. These forms include wrestling, judo, boxing, weight-lifting, hammer throw, pole vault, the longer foot races, high hurdles, and all forms of team games with the recent exception of volleyball.

These forms appear to be characterized by one or more of the following principles:

An attempt to subdue the opponent physically by bodily contact
Direct application of bodily force to some heavy object
Attempt to project the body into or through space over long distances
Cooperative face-to-face opposition in situations in which some body contact may occur.

It may be noted that the excluded team games are generally acceptable to college women in the United States at the level of intramural competition, and these games are popular during the years of adolescence. Some extramural competition is sponsored at the high school level, but this decreases in the college-age group, and only a very limited number of college women continue their interest in team games during their adult years.

2. Some forms of competition are *generally not acceptable* to college women in the United States, although they may be acceptable to a minority group within the college population. These forms include shot put, discus throw, javelin, the shorter foot races, low hurdles, long jump, gymnastics events, and free exercise.

These forms appear to be characterized by one or more of the following principles:

Direct application of bodily force to a moderately heavy object
Attempt to project the body into or through space over moderate distances
Display of strength in controlling bodily movements.

Few college women show any sustained interest in performance in these events, although some may have found them challenging during the early years of adolescence. Among the Olympic competitors from the United States, black women are disproportionately represented in the track-and-field events. In the gymnastic events, there is a preponderance of women of Germanic and Slavic ancestry, most of whom have developed their interests and abilities in ethnically defined social and athletic clubs rather than in the college setting.

3. Some forms of individual competition are *generally acceptable* to the college women of the United States, and competence in these events does not appear to militate against social acceptance by males within the college population. These forms include swimming, diving, skiing, figure-skating, and such non-Olympic events as golf, archery, and bowling.

These forms appear to be characterized by one or more of the following principles:

Attempts to project the body into or through space in aesthetically pleasing patterns
Utilization of a manufactured device to facilitate bodily movement
Application of force through a light implement
Overcoming the resistance of a light object.

In one way or another, all of these sports involve a considerable expenditure of time, money, or both; and participation is accordingly limited to women in the economically favored groups. Bowling, which is the least expensive insofar as time is concerned, and in which a moderately heavy ball is used, finds greatest favor with middle-class groups. Success in the other events may contribute to upward social mobility in some instances.

4. Some forms of face-to-face competition are also *generally acceptable* to college women of the United States, with no implication of limited social acceptance for successful competitors. These forms include fencing; such non-Olympic sports as squash, badminton, and tennis; and the team game of volleyball.

These forms appear to be characterized by one or more of the following principles:

Application of force through a light implement
Overcoming the resistance of an essentially weightless object
Maintenance of a spatial barrier that prevents body contact with opponent.

Fencing is not acceptable to certain religious groups, presumably because it symbolizes the destruction of human life. Adult competition in squash and badminton is limited largely to members of private clubs, but these groups include women from the middle as well as the higher socioeconomic levels. Tennis, which was once a private club game, is now commonly played by all groups having access to public facilities, but as yet only a few women from the darker-skinned minorities have reached the level of national competition. Volleyball is commonly played as a recreational game with mixed teams including both sexes.

It is of interest to note the difference between squash, which is socially acceptable for women in the upper economic levels, and handball, which is not. Here the distinction seems to rest on the use of a light implement to apply force in the one game and the use of the hand in the other. However, such resistance to hitting an object with the hand seems to be overcome in the growing popularity of volleyball.

In summary, it appears that the socially sanctioned image of feminine sports competition for college women in the United States may be derived from a few general principles:

1. It is *not appropriate* for women to engage in contests in which—

the resistance of the *opponent* is overcome by bodily contact.
the resistance of a *heavy object* is overcome by direct application of bodily force.
the body is projected into or through space over *long distances* or for *extended periods of time*.

2. It *may be appropriate* for women in the lower levels of socioeconomic status to engage in contests in which—

the resistance of an object of *moderate weight* is overcome by direct application of bodily force.
the body is projected into or through space over *moderate distances* or for relatively *short periods of time*.

3. It is *wholly appropriate* for women identified with the more favored levels of socioeconomic status to engage in contests in which—

the resistance of a *light object* is overcome with a *light implement*.
the body is projected into or through space in *aesthetically pleasing patterns*.
the velocity and maneuverability of the body is increased by the use of some *manufactured device*
a *spatial barrier prevents bodily contact* with the opponent in face-to-face forms of competition.

Within the context of the biological, mythological, and social interpretations of the nature of females, we may now examine the theory that the sports in which women compete serve to formulate some conception of the female's role as a consequential force within the universe of space, time, mass, and energy. At the international level, as represented by the Olympic Games, women are categorically prohibited from any attempt to overcome an opponent by direct application of bodily force. Since this prohibition cuts across all cultural lines, it would seem to be traceable to some biological difference common to the men and women of all social groups. The clue may lie in the differences between the ways in which males and females use their own bodily forces in the mutual act of procreation.

For the male, the procreative act may be construed in terms of direct application of bodily forces subject to the male's control. Conversely, the female role must be construed in passive terms as the act of receiving and nurturing new life rather than creating it by personal intent expressed in terms of bodily force. Thus, the male may use his own muscular powers to coerce the female and force her to submit to his will, but the female cannot similarly coerce the male. By extension, then, it may well seem biologically appropriate for the male to force another person to submit to his will by direct application of muscular powers through bodily contact; conversely, it would be biologically inappropriate for the female to coerce or subdue another person by use of the muscular powers of her own body.

This interpretation may be further extended in the roles assigned to men and women in the mortal combat of war. Here, men have long found it possible to justify their own attempts to coerce other men into submission by threat of death; but men have seldom permitted their women to engage in such direct forms of mortal combat. Athena may have carried her spear as she led men into battle, but, insofar as legend relates, she did not personally use her own body to wrestle with the enemy. Hippolyta and her Amazons did, on occasion, engage in hand-to-hand combat—but the most severe charge made against Hippolyta by the Athenians was that she had "fought like a man."

When the resistance to be overcome in a contest is centered in an *object*, rather than in the body of another *person*, the prohibitions against use of bodily force by women are stated in relative, rather than in categorical, terms. Here the issue seems to be, *How much force* may a woman appropriately apply to an object?

At the Olympic level, women are not permitted to lift heavy weights or to throw the hammer. They are, however permitted to put the shot, hurl the discus, and throw the javelin. Similarly, they are barred from the pole vault, the high jump, the high hurdles, and the longer foot races, but they are permitted to compete in the long jump, the low hurdles, and the shorter races. They are also barred from the more strenuous team games, but in 1964 they were permitted to compete in the milder game of volleyball—the only team game in which there is no possibility of direct body contact between opponents.

The facts of biology provide no logical basis of support for these relative distinctions. The number of women competent to perform in the excluded events may be small, but so is the comparable number of men; and this is generally true for all the events included on the women's list, with the numbers increasing as the events become less physically demanding.

Socially, however, there appears to be a relation between participation in such strenuous events and the kinds of work commonly done by the performer's parents. Women from homes in which both the father and mother are commonly employed in some form of manual labor may seemingly use their own muscular forces in athletics without impairing their own marriageability. Here the old fallacy of associating displays of strength with sexual inadequacy seems to be greatly weakened, although it still cannot be wholly dismissed as a factor in the determination of social approval. It must also be noted that even within the manual laborer group, social approval tends to decrease as the muscular forces demanded by the events increase.

Within the category of fully approved events, in which the contestant attempts to overcome the resistance of an object, strength is generally far less important than skill. The contested objects in such games as golf, archery, tennis, badminton, and squash are essentially weightless, and the objective of the contest is to move these objects through space by manipulating a light instrument with skill and speed. (The heaviest such instrument is probably the bowling ball, which even very small women can lift without difficulty.) This emphasis on instrumental manipulation is further emphasized in the face-to-face games by either nets or rules that prohibit bodily contact. (Even in fencing, in which the body of the opponent is touched by the instrument, the touch is symbolic rather than forceful.)

All these games were developed in the later years of human history by men called "gentle"—men whose personal status rested on the presumption of superiority in intellect and skill rather than on their muscular powers. But women did not participate in the early forms of these games. Not until the Industrial Revolution had created new forms of employment for women in industry, and not until women in the more socially favored classes had begun to claim some measure of personal equality with their husbands, did women begin to participate in these sports reserved for gentlemen.

Significantly, these sports pioneers seldom competed with men directly in any of these games, and there is still strong aversion to this form of competition. Today, the socially approved forms of competition in tennis, for example, are still man-man, woman-woman, and mixed doubles—in which the marriage relationship is symbolized by a partnership in which a man and woman combine their forces in a contest with another partnership team. Today, styles in doubles play are changing, but the most common strategy still emphasizes the man's strength of arm, while the woman uses her skill to support his efforts within a smaller part of their common court area.

Thus, in mixed doubles the woman still tends to play the role appropriate to Hera, the helpmate, as she uses the skills of Artemis and Athena and Hippolyta to support the efforts of her male partner, reinforcing his attempts to win the contest rather than threatening his mastery over their common environment. However, it must be noted that side-by-side play is now frequently seen in mixed doubles, particularly when both of the partners are superior players. So it would seem that men who are sure of their own strength and skill are not offended by displays of strength and skill in their mates—particularly when these female forces are combined with their own male forces to their mutual advantage.

Within the category of socially approved events in which the contestant attempts to project her body into or through space, women display a high degree of muscular strength as well as great skill and daring. In swimming, they propel themselves through the water with great speed, but they seldom compete in the longer distances. As Aphrodite noted, however, the water-supported movements of swimming display the female body to advantage, and it is noteworthy that the aesthetically pleasing patterns of synchronized swimming were developed by women, rather than by men. Similarly, women in gymnastics and free exercise have developed their own movement patterns, which emphasize grace and beauty to a far greater extent than do the standard events for men.

Diving, figure-skating, and skiing are also classed as graceful forms of movement, and in these sports personal velocity is greatly facilitated by the use of such manufactured devices as springboards, skates, and skis. The management of the high velocities produced by these devices requires both strength and skill, but it is skill that is emphasized.

Today, in the United States, the image of femininity projected by college women and endorsed by their potential mates is a "double image"—with one aspect identified as "woman at work" and the other identified as "woman at home."

As workers, these college women see themselves dealing with the forces of the universe in consequential ways, even as their men do. But neither the men nor the women picture themselves overcoming the resistance of mass, or of other persons, by sheer muscular force of bodily contact. Rather, they are prepared to use their wits in the realm of ideas, and they are adept in the use of lightweight equipment and manufactured devices that call for dexterity and skill rather than strength. On occasion, the men may still feel called upon to demonstrate the age-old conception of masculinity by performing feats of strength; but few college women seek this expression of their own human powers.

As potential wives and mothers, the college women are concerned with expressing their femininity in quite different ways. Recognizing their own biologically based need for dependence on the male wage-earner, they modify their behavior in ways designed to enhance their sexual desirability. They may also, on occasion, conceal their abilities as workers lest the man of their choice feel belittled by their competence.

Both sides of the image are evidenced in the socially approved list of sports for women. Strength and bodily contact are de-emphasized in favor of skill and grace; force is applied to weightless objects with lightweight implements; and velocity is attained by use of manufactured devices. And there is no serious competition in which women are matched against men. Rather, in those sports in which men and women participate together, they play as partners, with women generally accepting the supporting rather than the dominant role.

Thus, in our own time, it would seem that the college women of the United States have found it possible to combine the sexually based image of Aphrodite, Hera, and Demeter with the personal powers of Athena, Artemis, and Hippolyta, without doing violence to either, within the realm of sports competition.

Thus, too, the forms of competition they have chosen may be construed as a dramatic formulation of their conception of the complex roles females may play as consequential forces within the grand design of the universe. Perhaps Heracles and Pandora might have been dismayed by this interpretation of what a woman is and what she can do. But let it be said to the credit of Theseus that he foresaw this picture some 3,000 years ago when he described Hippolyta as everything a man might hope to find in a women. And let us remember, too, that the legend of his love for her has endured, time without end, through the long years of human history.

The Excellence of Patroclus (1968)

In this Olympic year, when everyone is talking about the virtues and vices of sport, it may be timely to ask, What is sport all about? Who originated the idea of throwing sticks and stones at the nothingness of empty space? What motivated him to devise rules for the performance of this absurd action? What emotions were generated by his attempts to perform this empty action in accordance with the rules he had devised for himself? Why were those emotions so complex? And why were they so often ambivalent?

In all truth, no one knows how it all began. But certainly the custom of holding stick-throwing contests at funerals was well established by the time of the Trojan Wars, which were fought some 3,000 years ago. Fortunately Homer repeated the legendary story of one of these funeral contests in the *Iliad,* so we may start our speculations about man's involvement in sport competitions with that early chapter in the long and always controversial history of sport.

Patroclus was a nobleman, a warrior, and a hero, who fought and died on the bloody plains of ancient Troy. In his brief lifetime, he did well and gloriously all that the gods and other men might expect such a man to do; and so, at his funeral, his companions thought it fitting to remind the gods of "the excellence of Patroclus" by calling attention to some of his most glorious deeds.

Thus, his companions threw javelins, hurled stones, drove horse-drawn chariots at full speed, ran as fast as a man could run, and wrestled with each

---

Delivered at the Faculty Club luncheon, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1968.

other in hand-to-hand combat. But they did not perform these glorious deeds in the same way Patroclus had performed them in the heat of battle.

On the battlefield Patroclus had seldom had an opportunity to demonstrate how far he could throw a spear. On the battlefield he had to throw on the run, and he had to throw at other men who were running toward him with their own spears at the ready; so he had to adjust his aim and force to the requirements of the moment, always keeping his own guard up to ward off the enemy spears and arrows. As he threw, other warriors often jostled him, or his feet slipped in the muck, or his throw was hampered or hindered by any one of the countless circumstances and necessities of war.

In the funeral competitions, the companions of Patroclus tried to rule out all those hampering and hindering circumstances. They tried to give each warrior a fair chance to demonstrate his own maximum spear-throwing ability by converting the deadly act of spear-throwing into the harmless act of throwing a stick at empty space, and they identified this nonconsequential act as a wholly voluntary action which a man might choose to perform for his own reasons. Then they set aside a time and place for the performance of this action and announced a set of rules that would impose the same conditions on all competitors; and they appointed an official judge, giving him the power to impose those same conditions on all men who entered the competition.

Thus, as each warrior stepped to the starting line, he knew precisely what he was going to try to do; he knew he would have a fair chance to perform that action as well as he could perform it; and he knew how the outcomes of his efforts were to be evaluated and by whom. Freed of all the hampering circumstances of war, he could go all out, holding nothing back. He was free to focus all the energies of his mortal being on one supreme attempt to hurl his own javelin at the nothingness of empty space. He was free to throw his own stick as far as he could throw it; or he was free to run as fast as he could run, to hit as hard as he could hit, to leap, to jump as high, as far, as he could leap and jump. In short, he was free to use his own human powers in open contest with the powers of other men. He was free to bring all the forces of his own being to bear on the performance of one self-chosen human action.

The Greek warriors created this moment of freedom for themselves—and for all men—by devising the paradoxical rules of sport competition. These rules impose restrictions on human behavior by defining one set of actions and by specifying how those actions may be performed. But within those restrictions they offer every competitor an opportunity to know the feeling of being wholly free to go all out, free to do his own utmost, free to use himself fully in the performance of one act of his own choosing.

These paradoxical rules created this man-made moment of freedom by ruling out the conditions that cloud the realities of man's earthly existence. They created this moment of freedom by ruling in the pattern of an idealized world in which every man might have an opportunity to make full use of himself—an ideal world in which every man might make full use of all the energies of his mortal being—unhampered and unhindered by the necessities of his life.

And so we must note that the Greek warriors did not show the gods how well Patroclus had actually performed the glorious actions of his life in the heat of battle. Rather, they showed the gods—and other men—how well each warrior could perform the empty action of throwing a javelin at the nothingness of empty space under ideal conditions that offered him a fair chance to do his utmost as a man among men.

What values did the Greek warriors find in the performance of these idealized and nonconsequential actions? Here we may turn to the experiences of their modern counterparts, letting three college students speak for all devotees of sport competition.

In one of the conversations that have been going on in my office for many years, Jim, a 250-pound lineman, told me about the "explosion of joy" that pervades every shred of his being when he does succeed in getting every ounce of himself into action. He said, "It's beautiful. . . ." Naively, I asked if it didn't hurt to hit and be hit; and he said, "No, not really, because the explosion of joy is all I feel." But then he added, "That's only when I really make it, when all of me is really there; but if I miss . . . if I goof off . . . if I don't get all of me into the action . . . then it hurts like hell."

Bob is a gymnast, and he said, "There's a feeling of wholeness in doing a routine on the parallels. When I start a routine, I'm not thinking about any part of myself . . . or what . . . or why. I know what I'm going to do; and there are no questions, no indecisions, no holding back, no rationalizing, no self-deception. From start to finish, all of me is involved in that action, and nothing is left out, nothing left over. Every shred of my being is involved in that routine . . . and in that action I am a fully integrated, fully functioning, fully involved human being. It's beautiful to experience your own wholeness."

Ann isn't much of an athlete. She is a reserved young woman who comes to the physical education building to play table tennis during the noon hour. She put it this way: "Maybe this sounds silly . . . but batting that absurd little ball back and forth across the net sort of makes me whole again. Most of the time I'm such a scaredy-cat . . . fussing, worrying, afraid, pulled in a dozen directions . . . so I can never really go all out about anything. But somehow, when I pick up that paddle, I know what I'm doing . . . and even though I don't do it very well, for a few minutes all of me is there . . . and somehow I seem to come into focus. Maybe it's silly to care so much about a silly game that I'm not very good at . . . but for me it's the most . . . the greatest . . . just to go all out without holding back. . . . It's beautiful!"

A man-made moment of freedom. A feeling of wholeness. The excellence of Patroclus. Truly it may be said that these are beautiful ideas. But what about the realities of sport competition? Does every sport contest reflect the beautiful ideals of human freedom, human wholeness, and human excellence? Alas, no. Homer's description of the funeral contests does not support any such exalted theory. Neither does any newspaper account of the events now occuring in Mexico City or any recollection of my own experiences on the golf course.

So let it be said to the glory of the Greek warriors—and to the glory of sport from that day to this—that most of the competitors did honor their own paradoxical man-made rules, and many did demonstrate their own human excellence within the idealized rules of sport competition. But they also argued with the officials and with each other. They boasted and bragged; they belittled the powers of other men; they devised strategies that gave them advantage over other competitors; they lost their tempers; they were often vindictive and vengeful; and many of them cheated their own rules when the officials were not looking, even as you and I have done in our own self-revealing moments of human wholeness, even as you and I have done in our own moments of commitment to the values we find in our own human actions.

Or, as the competitors in the early Olympic contests put it, every man who would submit his own excellence to the test of sport competition must "stand naked before his gods" and reveal himself as he is in the fullness of his own human powers. Stripped of all self-justifying excuses by the rules of sport, he must demonstrate his own ability to perform one human action of his own choosing; and naked of all pretense, he must use himself as he is, in all the wholeness of his being as a man.

In that self-revealing moment, each competitor must experience himself as he is—in all the complexity and ambivalence of his own feelings about himself, his gods, and other men who claim the right to share the universe of his existence. If he is a proud man, he will experience his own pride. If he is a domineering man, he will experience his own need to dominate the lives of other men. So, too, a fearful man will know his own fears, a resentful man his resentments, and an anxious man his anxieties. An idealistic man must recognize the reality of his own ideals and the conflicts he experiences as he tries to live up to them. A chauvinistic man must come to terms with his own chauvinism; a loving man must reveal the limits of his love; and a hating man will experience his own fearful hate.

In the self-revealing moments of sport competition, every man who would know himself at his best must also know himself at his worst. He cannot escape the implications of either image—because this is what he is, this is how he feels, and this is what he does when he has a fair chance to use himself fully in the all-out performance of one self-chosen human action.

Or, as Wallace Stevens has put it:

I measure myself
Against a tall tree.
I find that I am much taller,
For I reach right up to the sun
With my eye. . . .

Nevertheless, I dislike
The way the ants crawl
In and out of my shadow.

And so it was with the Greek warriors who celebrated the excellence of Patroclus by throwing their own javelins at the nothingness of empty space on the bloody plains of Troy some 3,000 years ago. And so it is with the excellent young men and women who are now throwing their own modern sticks at the thin air of Mexico City—or on the campus of modern Troy. And so, too, it is with many learned professors who bat tennis balls back and forth across holey nets or knock golf balls into empty holes.

Or perhaps I should say, This is how it seems to me. . . . How does it seem to you?

Dancers Create . . . (1971)

Long, long ago . . . before the beginning of time and space . . . the stuff of the universe was wholly without form . . . and unrelated blobs of formlessness were wandering about every which way . . . and all was chaos. But within those formless blobs was a need for relationships . . . a need for structure . . . a need for form. And so it was that the need for structure subdued the randomness of chaos and established orderly relationships between and among the formless blobs.

Time, space, air, water, earth, fire, vegetation, and moving creatures . . . all were brought into being by a need for structure . . . which no man can explain. And in time . . . perhaps 3 million years ago . . . perhaps only 2 million years ago . . . the structuring forces created a new kind of moving creature . . . a thoughtful creature who could question the structuring forces that had brought him into being . . . a creative creature who could enter into the creative process . . . and become a part of it.

And in time . . . this thoughtful, creative, moving creature began to compose a "new text of the world," a human text, "a text of intelligent men at the center of the unintelligible." These phrases were taken from a poem composed by Wallace Stevens, which goes like this:

Delivered at the Bi-National Dance Conference, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1971.

A new text of the world . . .
A scribble of fret and fear and fate,
From a bravura of the mind . . .
A courage of the eye . . .

A text of intelligent men
At the center of the unintelligible.

Here we shall skip the earliest chapters in the story of human creativity and move on to the time of the first clay pot—which was created about 10,000 years ago. And so we may picture the existence of a man known to me as Ug.

Ug knew something about rituals, dances, chants, and other musical sounds. He also knew something about picture-making, figurine-making, tool-making, and the process of agriculture. And he knew a few words and was able to deal with signs and symbols. But he knew nothing about the making of clay pots, because there were no clay pots in the universe at that time. So we may speculate about the process of bringing new structures into being by asking ourselves how Ug went about his own creative—and self-chosen—task.

As I think about my own attempts to bring new structures into the universe, it seems to me that they all begin in much the same way. They begin as a feeling of being perplexed by something I do not understand. (The word *perplexed* seems particularly appropriate, because it refers to the idea of many strands that are plexed or plaited or twisted together or tied in a knot.) At the time I feel this perplexed feeling, I may interpret it as indigestion or perhaps as an annoying headache. Then later, sometimes much later, I can think back to it and recognize that it was the feeling I usually feel when I am about to have an idea.

When Ug felt this perplexing feeling stirring within him, I think he probably behaved much as you and I do under similar circumstances. I think he walked around in a daze, stumbling over obvious sticks and stones, mumbling and muttering, picking things up and putting them down, often forgetting what he was doing, and being generally clumsy, irritable, and inefficient. And at times he just stood there, looking up, looking down, scuffing at the earth with his feet, and clutching at the emptiness of space with his hands.

In time, Ug's hands found a blob of clay, and he closed his fingers around it and left his own imprint in it. As Ug squeezed the clay with his hands, it crumbled and fell apart. So he dipped the dry crumbs in the waterhole. The water held the crumbs together, but the wet clay slithered between his fingers. So he mixed some air with the clay and water; and he mixed the heat of the sun with the water, air, and clay. And again and again he shaped and reshaped the mixture he held in his hands.

At about this point in my own creative pot-making efforts I usually begin to get some insight into the perplexities of my own feelings. And since I think all human beings probably sort out the perplexities of their feelings in much the same way I do, I think Ug probably sorted out the blurred and fuzzy relationships within his feelings in this way, too.

As he made the clay interact with water, air, and fire, he recognized some of the relations between and among these material elements. As his hands interacted with the clay mixture, he began to formulate some vague conceptions of hollowness, roundness, smoothness, and roughness. And as he dipped the clay in the waterhole, he began to understand more about how his form was related to the waterhole, how he was related to the waterhole, and how the form might formulate a new set of relations between himself and the water in the waterhole.

And perhaps some vague recognition of the hollowness of his cave, the roundness of the sun, of the smooth rounded hollowness inside his own thirsty mouth flitted through his awareness as he thought about some of the relations he was actualizing in the clay mixture. Perhaps . . . perhaps . . . perhaps . . . for who can say what a wordless man might think and feel when he discovers a coherent pattern of relations within a mixture of clay, water, air, and fire?

Gradually, bit by bit, Ug clarified his understanding of certain vaguely perceived relations by actualizing their patterns in the clay mixture. And in time he actualized his vague conception of the functions that might be performed by a hollow form by scooping a potful of water from the waterhole and placing it in his fire.

The evidence of history does not suggest that Ug's prehistoric companions were impressed by this demonstration of the utility of his new form, and my own experiences tend to confirm this impression. But in time, as Ug used his pot again and again and shared the food he cooked in it with his companions, some of them did get the idea. And soon many of them were making and using functional clay pots, even as many men are making and using such clay pots today.

Two of Ug's companions, who may be called Sci and Art, were particularly thoughtful men. As they worked at the task of making useful forms, they became intensely interested in what they were doing; and each man recognized his interest as a feeling of being perplexed by something he vaguely recognized but did not understand.

Sci felt there were certain similarities in the patterns of many forms—the rounded rim of the pot, the sun, the waterhole, the fire pit, and the circle of men who were huddling around the fire. So, in his scientific way, he tried to sort out his awareness of these similarities. He studied the pot carefully, focusing his attention on the rounded rim; and then he tried to sketch an outline of that rounded pattern. He also studied the sun and the waterhole and sketched the patterns of circularity he recognized in them. Then he superimposed the second and third sketches on the first one, but the outlines did not quite fit together, and there were little gaps and crossings around the edges.

So he tried to draw a wide line that would encompass all those gaps and crossings. And then he sketched some other examples of circularity and superimposed those sketches on the wide line. There were still a few gaps and crossings, so he smoothed these out by widening the line. Then he drew some more samples. And when he was confident that his all-encompassing line was wide enough to include the outlines of all circular forms, he traced a fine line that ran half-way between the edges of the wide line.

Thus, in his scientific way, Sci abstracted a generalized pattern of circularity from the particularities of many circular forms. And thus Sci defined the idea that is now represented by the word *circle* or by the formula $A=\pi r^2$.

As Sci worked away at his self-chosen task of defining a set of relations that may be recognized in many forms, he was often aware of many vague thoughts and feelings that seemed to flit through his awareness. But he did not want to pay attention to anything that might blur and confuse his understanding of the generalized pattern of all circles, so he did everything he could to exclude these vague fancies from his consideration.

In contrast, his friend Art welcomed every vague thought and feeling that strayed into his awareness as he focused his attention on the particularities of some of the patterns he half-recognized in the pot he was making. He was particularly interested in some patches of smoothness and roughness that had occurred more-or-less accidentally as he shaped the clay with his hands. And he was particularly interested in the vague conceptions and feelings that flitted through his awareness as he concentrated his attention on these patches.

The patterns within these accidental patches were not clearly defined. Some of the smooth places were very smooth; others were roughed up by accidental bits of roughness; and some of the rough places were blurred by accidental splotches of smoothness that confused the outlines of their rough patterns. And as he considered these blurred patterns, the vague conceptions and feelings that flitted through his awareness were equally blurred and confused.

So Art did what I think every artist does. He tried to think about the blurred patches and his blurred thoughts and feelings at the same time. He tried to juggle his awareness of both kinds of patterns up and down and back and forth, letting the two kinds of patterns interact with each other as they would. He tried to clarify and particularize his understanding of both kinds of patterns by exploring the interactions between them.

Of course, I think Ug and Sci did this too—because I think this is how all people try to sort out their feelings and thoughts about half-recognized relationships they do not quite understand. But I think Art was more keenly aware of his own deliberate attempt to juggle his own recognitions in this way.

He picked up a blob of clay and smoothed a little patch into it. Then he examined the patch carefully, searching out the patterns he had actualized in the clay. Then he turned his attention to the feelings and thoughts that had entered into his awareness while he was considering the clay patterns.

Tentatively, he flattened one projecting bit of clay and humped up another. He studied these new patternings carefully, and again he turned his attention to the patterns he found in his own thoughts and feelings. Had the change he had made in the organization of the clay clarified his awareness of the relations he was recognizing in his own thoughts and feelings? Or had it tended to blur and confuse them? Were his feelings and thoughts more interesting? Did he understand them a bit better? Or were they more vague and cloudy than before?

Tentatively, he shortened one line and lengthened another and paused to consider the effect this change had on the organization of his thoughts and feelings. Then he equalized two lines, and again he searched the depths of his awareness for his understanding of this symmetrical relation or that curvilinear arrangement or the relation between this acute angle and that obtuse one.

Dot by dot and line by line, he worked and reworked the patterns he was actualizing in the clay, searching for a particular pattern that might clarify his own understanding of a particularly interesting organization of thoughts and feelings. And thus, art clarified his understanding of the particular patterns he had actualized in the clay and of the thoughts and feelings that seemed to be evoked by his recognition of those patterns, and he had some understanding of the interactions between these two kinds of patterns.

But history does not suggest that Art's companions were greatly impressed by this formulation of his own understanding. And again my own experiences tend to confirm this observation. Some of them scarcely looked at Art's form; others glanced at it and turned away, muttering and mumbling about their inability to understand an idea that had not been defined and verbalized. Fortunately, however, some of them did focus their attention on the patterns Art had actualized in his form, and as they let themselves think and feel whatever they felt and thought as they considered this organization of patterns, some of them did find themselves thinking and feeling some very interesting feelings and thoughts.

So Art and Sci and Ug changed the structure of the universe by shaping clay with their hands. Or we might say, they created new sets of relations between men and the universe of their existence and actualized those relationships by making them happen in formless blobs of clay. Or we might say, they composed the format for a new text of the world, a text of intelligent men at the center of the unintelligible. Or we might say, they did what all choreographers and dancers do: they formulated a conception of structure—a conception of some of the relations within a structure—and brought that structure and those relations into being in their chosen set of materials. Or we might say, pot-makers formulate their conceptions of structure in clay; philosophers and poets formulate theirs in words; dancers formulate theirs by moving their bodies; and children use many kinds of material stuff, more or less indiscriminately.

Any material may be approached from a functional point of view or a scientific point of view or an artistic point of view. But whatever the materials or point of view may be, I think all human beings experience their own creative endeavors in much the same way.

But *why* did Ug involve himself in the process of shaping clay with his hands? Why do you involve yourselves in the process of creating dynamic structures by changing the relations within your body and between your body and the universe of space and time? And why do I wrestle endlessly with the feeling of perplexity that occasionally disturbs my being?

Why do thoughtful, creative human beings create manmade structures and man-made relationships? Why do they involve themselves in the task of composing a new text of the world . . . from a bravura of the mind . . . a courage of the eye . . . a text of intelligent men who exist in a unintelligible universe? Why? Perhaps we must leave that question to the structuring forces that brought the universe of time and space and creative men into being.

But perhaps we can answer the lesser question, *What* does man create? I think men create relationships. I think men create structure. I think men create form. I also think men create meaning. But that is another story. . . .

IV
Women In Action

I Like Being a Teacher (1950)

Sometime I would like to set up an experimental conference on the general plan of a Quaker meeting. We might come together with no planned program, enjoy the togetherness of sitting quietly while thinking about our mutual interests and problems, and speak as we were moved to speak about the things closest to our hearts. For sometimes we do have things we feel deeply about, things we want to "stand up in meeting" and talk about, and in the talking and sharing we might deepen our mutual concern and strengthen our individual faiths in the lasting values of the job we are trying to do.

Tonight I want to do that. I want to stand up in meeting and say something I think needs to be said, something we all believe, but something that gets pushed aside in the rush of carrying on our jobs. I want to stand up before you and make the simple statement, "I like teaching!" I want to say it as honestly and sincerely as I can, and I hope that while I say it, all of you will also be moved to say in your hearts, "Amen."

Testimony offered in Quaker meeting should grow out of experience, and by now you are wondering what has motivated me to the point of standing before you this late in the evening at the end of a busy day of meetings to expound the obvious. This is how it happened.

A short time ago I attended a homecoming meeting of the alumni of the School of Education of the University of Southern California. Mr. Goslin,

---

Delivered at the annual conference, Western Society for Physical Education of College Women, Asilomar-Pacific Grove, Calif., 1950.

superintendent of schools in Pasadena, was talking to us about "Education for a Free America." He mentioned our needs for better facilities, better programs, and better teachers. And as he talked about our need for both more and better teachers, he asked us, "How many of you have been responsible for bringing one new teacher into the profession? How many of you have helped one young person decide, 'I want to be a teacher'?"

I was still thinking about this when I picked up an issue of *Life* devoted to the topic, "Schools in U.S. Face a Crisis." I read about buildings, programs, what the public thinks of the schools, even about the symbolism of academic regalia, but finally I came to the articles about the teacher. How did *Life* picture us? The work is hard, the pay is low, and we have no personal life of our own. Off to teachers' meetings and conventions in our battered, second-hand cars, we have no time for vacations, no social life, and no opportunities to meet the men who will save us from our life of drudgery. Of course the children love us, but that is our sole reward, for on our slim salaries we have no fun, no decent clothes, no recreation, no hobbies, no interests outside the classroom, and no homes except a dingy boarding-house bedroom. A gruesome picture if I ever saw one! Devoted—but dull, drab, dowdy, and depressing.

Would any intelligent, vital, dynamic 18-year-old be able to read that description and still choose teaching as a life work? I think not. Why should he or she choose a job that is only for martyrs or half-witted nincompoops? Would he willingly choose to class himself as a substandard person in a substandard profession? If our young people take *Life* seriously, that article was enough to alienate a whole generation of the kind of young teachers we need.

Is it true? Are we really like that? Or are we intelligent, well-adjusted, well-housed, well-fed, well-dressed people, doing a job we enjoy and living a happy, satisfying life? Most of us who teach know that teaching is a good life, and most of us would not willingly change our profession. Then how did this picture painted by *Life* gain such wide acceptance that it can appear unchallenged in a magazine of nationwide circulation? Who is fooling whom?

As I thought about it, my mind went back to Dr. Goslin, the question he asked, and the question he didn't ask. Honesty forced me to admit that maybe we have done our bit in contributing to the general impression that the teacher's lot is not a happy one. We aren't vicious about it, but we are insidious. If someone tells us, "*You* don't look like a teacher," we simper, smile, and actually thank them as if they had paid us a compliment. I have even known teachers who went to great lengths to conceal their profession when they went on vacations or into new social groups. We talk about "the other old biddies" and describe them as "old-maid schoolteachers," but we always consider ourselves exceptions to the general rule. No teacher I know ever classes herself as a "typical teacher." Each of us is "different," and we feel that we don't really belong with the other "girls."

You've done it. I've done it. We all do. Why? What are we ashamed of? At that point I sat down and looked myself squarely in the eye. I said to myself, "Eleanor Metheny, you have been a teacher for 23 years. You've taught public school, private school, college, university, and adult classes. You've taught people at all ages, practically from the cradle to the grave. If anyone in the world is a typical teacher, you are. Before you start on the next 23 years, you'd better find out what this teaching business is all about. If you are really ashamed of it, if it really is a substandard profession, then for the good of your own soul admit it, get out of it, and get into something else while you still can."

So I sat down and started to make two lists. One was headed, "Why I Don't Like Teaching." The other read, "Why I Do Like Teaching." After two hours, I found that the "don't like" list covered a quarter of a page, while the "like" list had outgrown its original page and was crowded onto a whole stack of paper with many extra memoranda written in and interlined so I wouldn't forget anything. It is those two lists I want to talk about tonight.

First, the "don't likes." I don't like getting up at 7 o'clock in the morning five days a week. I don't like going to school when I have something I want to do in my garden, in my house, or on some social occasion. I don't like not having time enough to do everything I want to do. I don't like going to meetings when I'm tired or when they seem to be pointless. I don't like much of the paperwork, bookkeeping, grade-giving, examination-grading that every teacher has to do. And I don't like a few of my colleagues who continually whine, grumble, and complain. And particularly, I don't like to be associated with those colleagues who are constantly on the defensive about education and physical education. Not too imposing a list, is it? Where could I find a job that wouldn't have all or more of those drawbacks? Only in Utopia—and then I'd probably be bored because I wouldn't have anything to gripe about.

So let's look at the positive side. What has kept me in teaching for 23 years despite the fact that I could probably earn a living in at least two other fields?

I like teaching primarily because I like people. I like them young and growing and optimistic; and I like them mature, realistic, and still eager. Teaching is synonymous with people. They are our stock in trade.

I like teaching because I prefer ideas to things. I like to sell and convince people, but I'd rather sell ideas and attitudes than refrigerators. I wouldn't be happy in a job in which the outcome was measured only in money. I'd rather see it measured in terms of people—how they think, how they act, how they live and enjoy life. I've taught long enough to see some of the ideas I've tried to sell come alive in action and influence not only the people I've taught, but the people they have taught in turn. An idea is a living, growing thing; it has influence; it has substance; it does things to people. I find it satisfying to know that I am paid for having ideas and imparting them to people. And while I'm doing it, I don't have to make money for the firm for which I work.

I like teaching because my overhead is paid. For 23 years I've taken it for granted that the institution for which I worked, either public or private, would provide me with a place in which to ply my trade and give me the tools with which to do it. I don't have to pay rent for my office or my classroom or my gymnasium; it is just there, furnished with desks, chairs, bookcases, balls, rackets, nets, and heated, lighted, and cleaned for my comfort. I don't have to worry about finding the money for any of those things. On the first of September, I just walk in with my books, greet my friends, and start teaching.

I don't even have to worry about customers for my ideas! They, like the rest of the furnishings, are provided. There they are, waiting for me to sell ideas to them.

I like teaching because I'm an extrovert, an egotist, a ham actor, if you like. And my audience is a caged audience; it cannot get away from me. It has to listen! Many a ham actor would give 10 years of his life for such an opportunity—and it's mine five days a week.

In the classroom, I'm my own boss. I'm the person who shapes the course of events. Because I'm a good teacher, I let the customers participate in the planning, and I listen as much as I talk. But the important thing is that no one is looking over my shoulder telling me what to do next. The outcomes of every hour are determined by my thinking, my planning, and my working with people.

But before we get too far away from the subject of money, let's talk a minute about salary. I know it's popular for teachers to consider themselves underpaid. I think most of us are probably worth more money than we are getting, and I'll continue to fight for better salaries for teachers as long as I live. But I'll fight on the grounds that we're worth more because we are well-qualified, well-trained professional people doing a professional job, rather than snivelling for a dole to keep us alive because we are necessary drudges doing a distasteful job that has to be done by someone. But here among ourselves, let's be honest about this salary business. We aren't doing too badly these days. Our salaries are well above the national median. True, we don't buy many yachts, but we do buy homes, drive good cars, dress well, send our children to school well-fed, and manage to afford recreation in accordance with our tastes.

So I mean it when I say I like teaching because I like the salary I get. I like it for its regularity, for its tendency to increase through the years, and for the security it gives me. Comes the depression—and I taught through the big one—we may find our salaries lower; in fact we may even have to wait for them until the taxes come in, but we'll still be working. The electrician, the architect, the salesman may go unemployed, but there is never any shortage of customers for us. In war or peace, depression or prosperity, there will always be children; and in America, at least, I believe there will always be schools and teachers. My job provides me with sick leave, provision for a lifetime of disability if that should occur, with retirement at the end. Not affluence, to be sure, but a kind of security difficult to attain without sacrificing personal freedom.

I like teaching because I like the hours I keep—after I get up in the morning. I like weekends, and I like the little one-, two-, or ten-day vacations that break up our working year. My neighbors work 50 weeks a year with Christmas, New Year, Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, and Labor Day off. For me, Thanksgiving means four days, Christmas means about three weeks, Easter means spring vacation; I honor the names of Washington, Lincoln, and Columbus; plus a few days between terms for good measure. Normally I work about 170 days a year; my neighbors work 250 or 300! For them the question is what to do with their precious two weeks' vacation; I think in terms of a whole summer. And if I decide to sacrifice six weeks of it for summer session, that money is pure gravy!

I like teaching because it is a profession that does meet. I look forward to such meetings as Western Society because they give me an opportunity to get together with friends who do the same kind of thing I do. Our willingness to meet is evidence of our interest in our job, our recognition of common interests and common problems, a desire to find solutions for them, and a willingness to share what we know for the good of those who are doing similar jobs. Sometimes too many meetings may seem irksome, but they are the basis of our democratic society and our democratic approach to teaching in a democracy.

Yes, I like teaching because it is a cooperative rather than a competitive profession. The primary concern of all of us who teach is the betterment of those we teach and the world in which we live. To that end we meet, we share, we give freely to each other whatever we may have to offer. We don't patent our ideas or our methods, sell them to each other on commission, or try to hide them from each other for fear that others in our business may do a better job or sell more ideas. Of course we compete with each other in some ways. I suppose we do compete for prestige, for recognition of the success of our ideas. But it is a friendly, stimulating competition, not a dog-eat-dog competition for a limited market. We live and work in what is essentially a cooperative atmosphere, an atmosphere we often fail to appreciate because we have never known any other.

I like teaching because, as a woman, it gives me status of a kind difficult for a women to attain in other professions. As a teacher, I have all the masculine prerogatives, but I do not have to sacrifice the feminine privileges to get them. Teaching is traditionally a woman's field, and it is one of the few professions in which women are still the majority group. As men have come into teaching, we have made a place for them, welcomed them, and cheerfully relinquished many of the top administrative positions to them. But we have never had to compete with them, fight them, or ape them in order to hold our place as have women in many of the other professional fields. We are respected; we are essential; our place is secure; and no one wants to keep us out of it. True, at the college level we still are, and probably always will be, a minority group. But even here, we are recognized as valuable members of the faculty, necessary adjuncts to a coeducational program of education. True, also, we seldom hold the top administrative positions, but as *teachers,* even at the college level, our position is a secure, essential, and respected one.

While we are talking about being women, let's take a look at that "old maid" concept. Where did the idea of the old-maid schoolteacher come from? It arose by definition by boards of education many years ago. Practically all school boards at one time had rules prohibiting teachers from marrying or married women from teaching. Therefore, if a teacher married, she was no longer a teacher; and, by definition, all women teachers were unmarried women. Thus, the terms *teacher* and *old maid* were joined together by official decree, and the teachers who married—as teachers have always done—were no longer "old-maid schoolteachers."

That definition is rapidly vanishing and has completely disappeared in all but the most narrow-minded communities. It was on its way out in the 30s, and World War II dealt it the final death blow. In most large cities the married women teachers outnumber the unmarried ones, and in many school systems the concept of maternity leave has become commonplace—which ought finally to dispel the idea that all schoolteachers are frustrated spinsters.

Teaching and marriage were never incompatible, and today teachers who marry find that marriage and teaching fit well together. Those who take advantage of maternity leave and come back to teaching find it a profession that fits well with the business of raising a family. When the children are of school age, their school hours and the mother's working hours coincide. Even vacations coincide, which some mothers consider a mixed blessing!

But teachers have no opportunity to meet eligible men. Why not? Certainly they won't find them sitting in the front row of the first grade; and if a teacher spends 24 hours a day with her eyes and thoughts fixed on her classroom she probably won't meet many eligible men. But if she lives like a normal social human being in her community, she will meet the men there just as any other woman does. I can even remember one friend of mine who met her husband—and a wealthy one at that—at PTA! Let me hasten to add that he was a widower before I create the impression that teachers are potential homewreckers.

Many girls have hesitated to become teachers because, being normal young women, they wanted to marry and have a home of their own. I think it is time we set them straight on that point. Teachers of today decide to marry or not marry on the same terms as any other group of women, and I believe they have as many—or more—opportunities. The kind of men who shy away from teachers are usually not the kind of men we want to marry; and even those who are a bit leery of teachers as a group usually find that as individuals women who teach are "exceptional." If USC graduates and alumnae are typical, I'm sure that today's teachers not only can but do marry, for 85 percent of the addresses on our alumnae mailing list begin with "Mrs."

But suppose a teacher doesn't marry. Some of us don't, for reasons that may or may not be connected with the fact that we are teachers. As teachers we still have status and position in our community which few single women can attain and which many women marry to achieve. As a single woman living alone, I am not a "nobody" to be excluded or ignored. I am a *teacher*—respected, respectable, and accepted as a worthwhile person in my community. Being a teacher, I am assumed to be competent, independent, informed, and interested in community affairs. I am "the teacher who owns the blue house"—a very different designation from that given to my single neighbor down the street, who is known as "the woman who works who bought the green house." My opinions are sought; my cooperation is enlisted. The men respect me as an equal because I am a teacher. The women accept me because I work with children and can understand their problems as mothers. The children come to sell me Girl Scout cookies and chances on a bicycle, and they have their parents' permission to ring my doorbell on Hallowe'en, because I'm a teacher.

I live alone in my house, and no one questions my intentions or my right to do so. No one is surprised at anything I do. I come and go at all hours of the day or night, escorted or unescorted, in perfect propriety. I entertain what guests I choose, assorted or unassorted as to sex, and no eyebrows are raised. My ethics and morals are above question, because I'm a teacher. (Sometimes I find this thought a trifle depressing!)

Teachers as individuals, both men and women, take their status in the community for granted, not always recognizing how substantial it is. As a teacher, I am, by definition, educated, trustworthy, responsible, respectable, and interested in the public good. I do not have to prove myself. My credit is good anywhere and I can borrow money from any bank in town because teachers are honest and pay their debts. If I wish to rent a house or apartment, I am classed as a highly desirable tenant, because teachers are decent, dependable, and respectable people. I am welcome in any circle of the "best" people, because I am a teacher, informed, well-read, and socially acceptable. I may not always deserve all the consideration shown me, but I do not have to earn it as most people do. It is mine, because I am a teacher.

I like being a teacher because it marks me as an educated person, a person with well-established cultural interests, who has the right to associate with other educated persons on an equal footing. Being an educated person, I can earn my living by doing the things most people can do only in their leisure time: read, write, talk, and listen. These are the things I would do for recreation if I "worked" instead of taught, but as a teacher I get paid to do them.

I like teaching because it has brought me friends by the hundreds, friends of all ages, friends in all parts of the country. This, like many of my other blessings, I had always taken for granted until last spring when I spent some time in the hospital. Almost before I was in bed the flowers started to come, until my end of the room looked like a gangster's funeral. The cards poured in by the handful in each mail delivery, until I became embarrassed by the somewhat envious glances of the other two women in the room. One day after an especially crowded visiting hour, the nice older woman in the next bed said to me, "You really do have a rich, full life, don't you?" I answered without thinking, "Yes, I do—but then, you see, I've been a teacher for 23 years." Thinking it over later, I realized I'd said something quite profound. I've never considered it unusual to have so many friends that I can't always keep track of them all. I've just taken it for granted. And so do all of you—because you are teachers. It is our business to know people, and because we are essentially nice people, most of the people we know become our friends. If you don't believe me, just count the number of people who think enough of you to send you at least a Christmas card this year. Then go next door to your nearest neighbors and do a little comparing. And if you ever take the time to sit down and try to count your friends, you'll be surprised to find how many of them are also teachers. Yes, I like teaching because it has given me friends beyond counting, and many of those friends are teachers.

This listing of reasons why I like teaching could go on and on, extended endlessly with incidents that have made me aware of my blessings, but to sum it all up, after 23 years of it I can still say I like teaching because it has been fun. It has given me a rich, full, satisfying life. I've often been tired, and sometimes

I've been discouraged, but I've never been bored. There have always been too many interests and too many people in my life to allow time for boredom. My only complaint is that I've never had time to enjoy all of them as much as I'd like. As I compare my life with the lives of other women I meet socially or at Business and Professional Women's Club, I know I have something that many of them envy. Teaching has given a sense of direction to my life, a sense of my own value in the world, and a continuing sense of growth. I could earn a living in many ways, but teaching is not just a way to earn a living, it is a way of life. It's a good life, and I like it.

Some time ago two psychologists were trying to find the simplest question that would reveal the most about the individual, his attitude toward himself, and his adjustment to the world in which he lived. They reported their findings in a national magazine. The question was, "Who are you?" As I read the article, I did as they directed, and said the first thing that popped in to my head. I answered, "I am Eleanor Metheny, a woman who teaches." Then I read their interpretations. I had indentified myself as a person; I had identified myself with my own sex; and I had identified myself with a purposeful group. According to their findings I was a well-adjusted, happy person! I believe most teachers are.

I believe most of us here, if we took the time to think about it, could honestly say with Jan Struther:

One day my life will end; and lest
Some whim should prompt you to review it,
Let one who knows the subject best
Tell you the shortest way to do it.
Then say: "Here lies one doubly blest."
Say: "She was happy." Say: "She knew it."

That's what I wanted to say to you all tonight, because I think it needs to be said—clearly, honestly, and often. Perhaps not quite so personally, not quite so emotionally, as I've said it tonight, but quietly, pleasantly, and with conviction. We have no need to belittle ourselves. Teaching is a good life; we like it; we'd choose it again without the slightest hesitation if we had our lives to live over. Then in our own undramatic, effective way, let's tell the world about it. Let's hold up our individual and collective heads proudly and happily so boys and girls of the next teaching generation can look at us and say without hesitation, "I *want* to be a teacher!"

Female Folklore, Fiction, and Fantasy (1958)

Men have always talked about women, and the words they have said and written about us are beyond counting—words of praise and blame, words of sentiment and annoyance, words of fascination and irritation, and above all words expressing man's confusion about that noble, tantalizing, frustrating, and indispensable creature, the female of the species. In recent years women have begun to talk and write about themselves, and in all truth they seem to find themselves just as confusing and contradictory as men have found them. But before we get to that we must take a brief look at the male point of view, because it does help to explain much of our present confusion about ourselves.

Whatever men have said about women through the years, either flattering or unflattering, the underlying theme has been, "Man's desire is woman's duty." Except in the matriarchal cultures—which have been few in number—men have always taken it for granted that it was their right to decide what a woman should be. Accordingly, they set up their own "job specifications" for the task of being a woman; and when women failed to meet these specifications the men were greatly annoyed with them, even thought their several sets of specifications were sometimes mutually contradictory.

Perhaps the most comprehensive itemization of what men thought a woman should be is found in *Proverbs*, Chapter 31, beginning, "A virtuous woman who shall find? Her price is above rubies." Virtuous, as used here, has no sexual connotations, but certainly the woman described would have been worth

---

Delivered at the biennial meeting, National Association for Physical Education of College Women, Excelsior Spring, Mo., 1958.

many fine rubies to any husband. She had strong arms and willing hands. She sought flax and wool and spun them into fine garments for her family, made coverings of silk and purple for herself, and wove bolts of fine linen to sell to the merchants. She brought food from afar, and with the fruits of her industry she bought a field and with her own hands planted and tended a vineyard. Her "candle goeth not out at night," but she was still up before dawn to give meat to her household and feed the poor and needy. Her industry and thrift promoted her husband's career, her own bearing and demeanor enhanced his reputation, and she spoke always with wisdom and kindness. These particular verses make no mention of the fact that she also satisfied her husband's sexual needs and bore him many fine children, but of course she did, because her husband as well as her children rose up and called her blessed. She, herself, looked forward to her own rejoicing only "in time to come."

Even allowing for poetic license, this is a pretty big order for any woman. But this was not all. The literature shows that men also desired a quite different creature, one that Shakespeare described as "a tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide"—the hide of the docile homemaker. According to Sophocles, this paradoxical paragon never asked questions or argued about anything. He put it bluntly, "Woman should be seen and not heard." (But when they had to speak, as we all know so well, their voices were ever soft, gentle, and low—an excellent thing in woman.) Legally, however, it made little difference whether they spoke or not, because no one listened to them. As Blackstone put it, "In marriage, the husband and wife are one, and the husband is that one."

For many centuries men believed that "men have marble, women waxen minds," but somehow the marble often failed to make a lasting impression on the wax. In their own devious ways, even the most docile helpmeets found ways to outwit their husbands, and the "tiger hearts" were adept at twisting strong men around their slightest whim. Men found this irritating because they simply could not understand how women managed to get around them, and they expressed this irritation by attributing to women a long list of sneaky and vengeful characteristics that take up several columns in the index to Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*. Of course, in their more sentimental moments, they also called them ministering angels touched with a spark of heavenly fire and many other good and noble things—but I shall spare you that list because you have heard it many times—and at times believed every word of it was true.

The lists of adjectives compiled by women were not recorded for inclusion in Bartlett, but then, as now, they described men in two sets of terms. One set they recited to men's faces, and the men accepted them as true; the other set was mentioned only in the privacy of the ladies sewing circle—a list of terms men would have found quite incomprehensible.

Human beings being what they are, there was probably some measure of truth in every adjective, good and bad, on all four lists; and human beings being what they are, we may be sure that love did temper many of the angry words of irritation, just as human compassion gave greater validity to the words of tenderness and admiration. The tragedy of the past lies not in the contradictions in these lists but in the fact that the irritation was intensified and the healing power of love was weakened by the very nature of the assumptions that defined all relationships between men and women through the long centuries. Shakespeare put it succinctly, "Such duty as the subject owes his prince, even such a woman oweth to her husband."

A prince may relish authority, but the responsibility that goes with such authority often lies heavy on his shoulders. Humanly he is bound to feel that his authority to discharge that responsibility should never be challenged. Humanly, too, he is impelled to expect not only unquestioning obedience but also gratitude and admiration from the subjects whose lives depend upon his beneficence. For the subjects, the posture of perpetual obeisance is difficult to maintain, and even the most docile must at times become restive—even though the docile one may have no wish to accept the responsibilities that go with freedom. Thus, both the ruler and the ruled must at times feel abused and put-upon, and hostility flowing in subterranean channels must ever erupt in irritation about seemingly trivial matters.

But through the long years of history the prince-and-subject relationship was not confined to marriage. It was the accepted pattern for all human relationships. And it was a seemingly trivial matter—a tax on tea—that produced the eruption that challenged this concept of human authority over the lives of other human beings and established a new concept of human equality. And in time this new way of life called democracy was extended to include female as well as male human beings. Considering the recency of this tradition-shattering interpretation, it is not surprising that women are confused about what they *are*, what they think they *should* be, and how they may best conduct themselves in this strange new world of human equality.

I have rehearsed our old griefs here, not to dwell on them with bitterness, but to recognize the hold these old interpretations still have on our lives. From them we derive the folklore, the fictions, and the fantasies that vitiate our enjoyment of our new-found privileges and hold us back from a realistic attempt to find valid answers to the questions: What *is* a woman? What is her place in the grand design of life envisioned in terms of human equality and human worth?

Folklore embodies all the traditional beliefs of our ancestors. We learned these beliefs from our parents, as they learned them from theirs, long before we were able to reason about them. As children, we accepted them implicitly as a part of all the other knowledge we were gradually acquiring about "how the world is," and they became an integral part of our thinking about the world and ourselves. Accordingly, any attempt to challenge our folklore upsets us emotionally, because it disturbs the certainties by which we have always lived.

If the belief being challenged is one that gives us status or special privilege, we become angry at the thought of being denied privileges to which we feel entitled. But if the belief being challenged is one that belittles us, we still cling to it with emotional fervor. Even in our adulthood, going counter to what our parental authorities considered right makes us feel guilty of wrongdoing. This feeling of rightness has nothing to do with fact or logic. It is truly a "feeling," and our resistance to exploring it is far more emotional than rational. Like children who have defied their parents, this guilty feeling makes us angry, defiant, or defensive—attitudes that have characterized many women of our times who have done things their ancestors believed were not right for a woman to do.

Nonetheless, folklore can be challenged, as it has been many times, and with what Beatrice Webb has called "the inevitability of gradualness," it can eventually be obliterated from our attitudes. In 1920, for example, Irene Castle set the world on its ears when she cut off what was then called "woman's crowning glory." This event, which would now pass without comment, was given far more publicity than the 19th Amendment, which was finally ratified that same year. Editors editorialized about it. Preachers preached about it. And in many homes across the country fathers and husbands were pounding the tables shouting, "No! It isn't *right* for women to cut their hair." I know. I was sitting at one of those tables. My father, too, said, "You can't go against nature. If the Lord had intended your hair to be short, he would not have made it grow." Like many other girls, I became defiant. I said, "But Daddy, the Lord makes your hair grow, and you cut it off every Saturday night." And I, too, got the unanswerable answer, "That's different. I am a *man*."

In the end, I did what the one who is ruled has always done. I knew I couldn't win by force, so I resorted to strategy. My hair was so long I could sit on it. The utility of that particular virtue escaped me then, as it escapes me now, but in 1920 this was considered the hallmark of femininity. Instead of sitting on my tresses, however, I made enormous "cootie cages"—in the style of the day—and then came to table nightly with the rest of my hair piled loosely into a crown that was anything but a glory. Truly, I was a sight to behold, and my father finally got tired of beholding it. He capitulated, choosing what must have seemed to him to be the lesser of two evils.

On a memorable Saturday night in 1921, my father, mother, sister, and I walked solemnly to the barber shop—the *men's* barber shop. As the cold steel of the scissors slid beneath my ear, I almost panicked, for the horrifying thought could no longer be put off. What if I was wrong and Dad was right? Fortunately, I could see him in the mirror, and as he pulled out his hankerchief and blew his nose with great vigor in the traditional masculine attempt to conceal his emotions, I stiffened my resolve, and my hair fell to the floor in great swatches. Silently my mother bent and gathered my shorn locks together and wrapped them in tissue paper, and silently we all walked home.

After I had laid my cut-off hair in a bureau drawer, my mother got the curling iron and tried to subdue the cropped ends so I could appear in church the next morning. I did—getting a mixed reception compounded of shrieks of congratulation at my daring, dubious approval, and much head-shaking over my temerity.

In time, people got used to it, and other girls cut their hair, one by one. Two years later my father shrugged his shoulders when my sister decided to have her hair cut, too. Fifteen years later my mother followed suit, but only because she thought it might relieve her headaches!

This is the story of all attempts to change traditional beliefs about what is right for women. Initially, they meet with tremendous resistance—and well they may, because our awkward first attempts often seem disastrous. My first haircut was atrocious! But as women experimented with short hair through the years, finding new ways to shape and curl their coiffures, they gradually found styles that were more becoming. As they did, the resistance receded, and in time it was evident that there was no basic connection between a woman's virtue and the length of her hair. It also became apparent that short hair did not necessarily make any woman ''more like a man''; rather it was recognized that women had simply adopted a convenient solution to a common problem and adapted it to their own concept of femininity.

But the emotional hold our folklore has on us persists long after we have identified its fallacies. Significantly, I kept my discarded and useless hair wrapped in tissue paper in a bureau drawer for many years—imperishable evidence that I had once been everything my father thought a woman should be. Today, the emotions of women are still cluttered with many such treasured symbols of the past, symbols of our claims to special privileges, symbols that prove that we are what our grandfathers believed we were, symbols that demand that we be treated as cherished subjects.

Folklore can usually be identified by our emotional reactions to it, but half-facts are far more slippery because they always have a basic element of truth in them. It is a truth that holds good only under certain specific conditions, and we tend to forget about those conditions as we extend the limited truth to a universally true generalization.

One of our more pervasive half-fact forms of confusion stems from our tendency to identify *averages* as *norms* or as criteria of normality. This fallacy denies the uniqueness of the individual and his implicit human right to be as he was created.

Take, for example, the half-fact that men are taller than women. It rests on the fact that the *average* of men's heights is about four or five inches greater than the *average* of women's heights. But an average is derived from a *range* in which, as we know from daily observation, many women are taller than some men, and vice versa. The harm is done when we convert this statistical *average* derived from a *range* of heights into a *norm*—thus making tallness for men and shortness for women a criterion of normality. This leads us to subscribe to the popular belief that normal men should be taller than normal women, and thus we stigmatize as sexual oddities all short men and all tall women. This forces short men and tall women to the conclusion that they are not what a normal member of their own sex should be, and the emotional trauma suffered because of this fallacious belief is too well known to need explication here.

This tendency to convert half-facts into universal *shoulds* is the basis of much of our current confusion about the nature of women—and of men. The confusion is compounded by the quizzes in popular periodicals that ask, Are women more illogical? More verbal? Are men more mechanically adept? More competitive? The "right" answers, found on the next page, tell us that "research shows" they are. But what the research really shows is a difference between averages, found within two overlapping ranges of scores that reveal that the traits measured are about equally distributed in the two sexes.

Our society tends to encourage the development of these stereotypes. Little boys are given mechanos and erector sets; little girls are given dolls. Thus, "boys in general" tend to become more adept at working with machines, while "girls in general" tend to develop skill in folding diapers. But despite this early encouragement, many boys never learn to fix a leaky faucet, and many girls do learn to take down the carburetors in their own sports cars. Similarly, many girls do not become "good little mothers," while many men are remarkably adept in dealing with small children. (And I have noted, as you have, that some girls are highly competitive, and some men are averse to competition.)

This is not to say that there are no significant differences between men and women. There are, and they are important differences that affect every aspect of every woman's (or man's) life. But our uncritical conversion of the half-facts of averages into norms for femaleness and maleness obscure our understanding of these *real* differences and the significance they have in structuring the roles each woman may play in her lifetime.

Our half-facts tend to support our folklore because our reliance on folklore as the basis of our *shoulds* has led us into these fallacious interpretations. Together, half-fact and folklore serve to perpetuate the stereotypes of maculinity and femininity that represent what our ancestors believed men and women *should* be. Our masculine stereotype embodies the qualities of the ideal and invincible frontiersman; our feminine stereotype portrays his ideal wife, an old-world *hausfrau* with a strong dash of courtesan. (Both types are satirically portrayed in Al Capp's comic strip of Little Abner and Daisy Mae—with further comment made in the characters of Abner's parents!)

In a more serious vein, our acceptance of averages as norms that indicate what a "real man" or a "real woman" should be like has condemned many men and women to an unhappy choice between two grim alternatives. Either they feel they must try to be something they are not, or they must live with a feeling of failure and rejection born of being or doing what a man—or woman—should not be or do.

We women justify our attempts to fit ourselves into these old rigid molds on the grounds of necessity. At one level we claim that our hope of marriage depends on our ability to be "as men desire us"; at another level we claim that men rule the world outside the home, and our only hope of success lies in pleasing them. Certainly the price of not conforming to a generally accepted pattern may be very high, but is it higher than the price we pay in clinging to the conviction that we are obligated, at all costs, to keep the favor of all men—or at least to not irritate them too much?

Sadly enough, our own fearful pretenses drive men to pretenses that are even more painful, for our skill in pretending only serves to convince them that we will not love *them* if they fail to measure up to the male stereotype we seem to be holding up before them. The pressure this fear of not measuring up to male norms puts on men is far greater than any pressure we women live under, for the masculine stereotype of the absolutely invincible creature who is superior in all things is an ideal no human being can possibly attain. We women can always excuse our failures by retreating to the old belief that we really are "the weaker sex." Men can find no such relief from their own self-condemnation.

The logical solution of separating the facts from the half-facts and trying to live honestly with ourselves as we are requires great emotional maturity from both sexes. Human beings being what they are, such objectivity is not easy to attain. But what is the alternative? Do we women want to kneel forever before our princes? There are those who believe we do, no matter how much our knees may pain us and our necks ache from the continual strain of looking up in search of loving approval. But we must not overlook the fact that maintaining this awkward posture forces our princes to look down, and their necks, too, may well ache from the continual strain of a bent head. Perhaps if we women could find the faith we need to stand upright so we might communicate with our princes at the eye-to-eye level of human dignity, human worth, and human individuality, we might have fewer irritating headaches, and the men's headaches, too, might be decreased by the privilege of maintaining a fully erect posture.

But are men ready to relinquish the stereotype of male superiority? Some are; many are not. And many women will still choose the bent-knee, bent-neck posture. But many of us in this room have surely reached the age and emotional security that will enable us to risk some male disapproval. Perhaps the finest contribution we can make to democracy is to get off our knees and look our male associates in the face at eye level—not belligerently, not defiantly, but naturally and pleasantly, as befits women of our stature. Certainly we who have established ourselves in a profession once limited to men can afford to take whatever risks our choice may entail, for we have nothing to lose and much to gain by taking the kinks out of our necks. Certainly this will irritate the more neurotic of our male associates whose belief in their own superiority must be nourished by conviction of the inferiority of other people. But what is accomplished by making their neuroses our neuroses? I am sure, too, that we shall also find that many men will find us easier to deal with as easing the crick in our knees and the kink in our necks takes some of the irritability out of *us*. Equally, I am sure that we will like ourselves much better in the erect posture we have so often recommended to our students.

But we must move on to fiction. The fiction writer begins with a scene or situation that resembles "reality" to the extent that the reader can recognize a world somewhat like his own. Within this world, the writer creates characters with whom the reader can identify—persons much like himself or other people he may know. The story revolves around a problem the reader recognizes or might have experienced in his own life. The job of the fiction writer is to solve that problem. And he must solve it, or create the illusion of having solved it, in a finite segment of time. He does this by tampering with the realities of life. He picks and chooses among the relevant facts, ignoring some, emphasizing others. Then he organizes these selected "facts" into a pattern that seems to provide a solution for the problem by banishing it forever from the lives of his characters.

Of the many pervasive fictions that clutter women's lives, perhaps none is more damaging than the belief that the grass is always greener on other people's lawns. The argument runs something like this: My own problems make me unhappy. Therefore, people who do not have my problems must be happier than I. The fictional element is obvious. We reach this conclusion by ignoring *their* problems, thus eliminating them from the story.

The greener-grass fiction takes many forms. In the "good old days" when men were men and women were females, and let's have no nonsense about equality, grandma did not have the problems we have today. Therefore, according to many popular fiction writers, grandma was much happier than we are. This leads to the solution that women find happiness by forsaking the ways of equality and returning to the ways of their grandmothers. It is a wonderful, sweeping solution which provides the "pat answer" to everything that troubles women and men today. But like all fictions it ignores part of the facts. It ignores the problems that grandma—and grandpa—had and the complexity of their lives, which were different from, but no less complex than, our own. It ignores, too, the fact that the clock of history cannot be turned back.

How happy were your own grandmothers and great-aunts? Did they all spend their days singing hymns of joy? Or do you number among your female—and male—ancestors at least one or two who were cranky, cantankerous, and downright neurotic! I'm sure you do, and I am sure that you will also find among your ancestors of both sexes some solid, good citizens who did what was required of them in their moment of history and with cheerful countenances.

One of my own great-grandmothers produced 22 children in 21 years! She accomplished this remarkable feat by bearing five pairs of twins. I'm sure she had a full life; certainly it was a productive one, although it has an element of excessive repetition. I don't know how happy she was, and my guess is that she was probably too busy to ask. But I do know that I do not envy her. Probably I have problems she did not have, but I do not have to cope with 22 offspring. Another of my great-grandmothers was five feet tall and weighed 290 pounds—but that is another story.

Fiction provides an appealing approach to the problems of our lives. If we could only ignore the facts that make our problems complex, life could be so beautiful! The deluding element in fiction, however, often leads us to subscribe to the illusion of a "better reality" and motivates us to reject the realities in our own human situation. Accordingly, we refuse to make the effort the human situation demands of those who attempt to deal with real problems in a constructive way.

Our fictions are not always rooted in the past. We have our contemporary ones, such as the belief that "other women" are more fortunate than I. The homemaker envies the woman who has her own paycheck; the woman with the paycheck envies the woman who has "nothing to do" all day. And both ignore the dry sandy patches of tedium and the devil-grass of responsibility that mar her neighbor's lawn, while belittling the green grass that grows on her own domain. What both really want is the "better reality" of privilege without price—a fictional reality that is hard to find in any world! It is interesting to note that our relative evaluation of other women's lives seldom extends to the widow with three children who cleans the floors in our office buildings after we vacate them. "Poor thing! That is *her* misfortune. But her problems must be worked out as best she can resolve them, because that is how life *is*."

Fiction always maintains the semblance of reality. It becomes fantasy when we create an entirely new world out of whole cloth. In fantasy, if we need a little green man with a pointed head, we create him; and if we need to disintegrate him, it is a simple task to create a gun that will blow him to bits. In short, in fantasy we create a world designed to satisfy our own desires and needs. Such fantasies as may be created by a great writer like Ray Bradbury can be delightful reading. So, too, our own fantasies can be equally delightful. But they become disastrous when we begin to believe in the world we have created. This is the essence of neurosis—to believe the world *should* conform to some personal fantasy. The essence of psychosis is to believe that it *does!*

One fantasy we have all heard expounded many times—often on the Career Days we arrange for college women—is "Women today can do anything men can do." To support this shopworn statement we trot out the fact that some women are now listed in every job classification identified by the Census Bureau. This does demonstrate that one or more women have managed to work in all major job classifications, but even at this level it ignores the facts about women's employment, so beautifully assembled by the National Manpower Commission in the book called *Womanpower*. Essentially, the majority of women now working are employed in areas classified as "women's jobs," and those who are working in areas commonly reserved to men are, in general, performing these men's jobs in their own woman's way. The entire pattern of women's employment, as it has developed during the past 50 years, is almost totally different from the pattern of male employment; and *Womanpower* makes it clear that women are working "like women" in ways identified with the female values in their own lives. As women did with short haircuts, so, too, they have done with the right to work—they have adopted a principle and then adapted it to fit their own female and feminine requirements.

The fantasy that women can do anything men can do is easily extended to the more fantastic statement, "Any woman can do anything she wants." To the girls at Career Day this suggests that I, being a woman, can do anything I would like to do. And after graduation this is readily transformed into the neurotic belief that I *should* be able to do anything I want to do, and any person or condition that prevents me from so doing is therefore *wrong*. But this puts us squarely in the never-never land of neuroticism, verging on the psychotic's belief that he is actually the creator and ruler of the world of fantasy in which he lives.

This fantasy of a world in which a woman *should* be able to do anything she wants runs through many books that are one long whine, however humorously expressed, about "the dilemma" in which educated women find themselves. This same neurotic strain also confuses many of our current attempts to find valid answers to the democratic question, What *is* a woman?—and its inevitable counterpart, What *is* a man?

Certainly it is difficult for all of us, complex and fallible human beings that we are, to be objective about ourselves as we try to identify our common needs, as well as our uniquely individual potential for contributing to the grand design of human life. It is to our credit that we hold meetings such as this to try to sort out the facts on which to base our conclusions about what is appropriate for women in our time. And perhaps it will be helpful to all of us to recognize that our thinking on these questions is never purely rational.

We are the products of our history. Our folklore has a strong hold on our emotions; we are prone to accept half-facts as universal truths because we have so long been accustomed to the stereotypes they describe. We cling to our comforting fictions, and like all ego-motivated individuals we try to evade acceptance of our human limitations by complaining that the world is not what it should be.

But if we cannot immediately change every element of our all-too-human natures, perhaps we can at least recognize our own human predispositions. If we cannot wipe out the consequences of our history with one quick wave of the hand, perhaps we can recognize the factors that helped to shape that history. And as we live in our own time—as all human beings have always had to do—perhaps we can recognize that our own behavior will help to write the history of the future.

Our moment in history will demand its concessions and its compromises within the democratic ideal of a freedom in which all persons can stand erect in their implicit right to be what they are, as they were created. But if we truly believe in this ideal, we can move it a little further toward reality by trying to exemplify its premises in our own lives. To us, the American women born in the 20th century, much has been given. Accordingly, much may be demanded of us. May we find the faith we need in ourselves to give freely whatever life may demand. May we give it cheerfully, pleasantly, and objectively—accepting without complaint the "inevitability of gradualness," even as we accept our own human fallibility as implicit in the human condition. And as we move forward together, may we now and then find time to laugh with each other about our inconsistencies in the healing atmosphere of mutuality engendered by gathering together around a banquet table such as this.

The Story of DGWS: 1892-1958 (1958)

A pageant presented by the Division for Girls and Women's Sports at the 60th National Convention of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Kansas City, Mo., March 1958
(Music arranged by Catherine Allen, University of Pittsburgh; properties and backstage management by Eunice Way, Smith College)

Introduction

At the sixtieth national convention of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation the importance of the contribution being made to the objectives of the Association by the women interested in sports and athletics was formally recognized by the creation of a DIVISION FOR GIRLS AND WOMEN'S SPORTS, headed by a vice-president of the Association.

On this significant occasion it seemed appropriate to review the historical development of girls and women's sports, and it also seemed fitting to honor the many women who, both figuratively and literally, had "carried the ball" through the long years during which the concept of "desirable practices in sports for girls and women" had been in process of formulation. These two objectives were accomplished by the presentation of a pageant in the Sports Arena of the Kansas City Convention Hall on March 31, 1958.

The script for the pageant was based in part on the official publications of the Basketball Committee, the Committee on Women's Athletics, the Section on Women's Athletics, the National Section on Women's Athletics, and the National Section for Girls and Women's Sports. These publications provided the chronological framework for the pageant, but the interpretation of the recorded events was evolved from bits and pieces drawn from the memories of the women who had helped make the historical events happen. Essentially, the facts may be considered reasonably accurate; the interpretations given to those facts are inevitably tempered by human fallibility—of which the largest share must be acknowledged by the writer of the script.

When the pageant was presented, the performers were dressed in historically accurate costumes, assembled from the attics of many homes and the storage rooms of many institutions, including the Smithsonian! The narrator stood at a microphone placed at the side of the stage. The accompanist (accordion) and the prompter were offstage but in sight of the narrator, who gave them their cues by hand-signal as needed. The honored guests were seated in two groups directly in front of the stage on either side of the aisle used for the final procession.

The cast included:
Narrator
Accompanist
Prompter
1893 — Calisthenics girls (2)
1918 — World War I military personnel
1918 — World War I Red Cross nurse
1920 — a suffragette
1928 — a sports official
1942 — World War II military personnel (4)
1942 — Red Cross personnel (2)
Sports Performers
1893 — Basketball (2)
1922 — Hockey
Soccer
Swimming
Track and Field
1924 — Modified Sports
1925 — Baseball
1928 — Volleyball
1930 — Winter Activities
1933 — Lacrosse
Speedball
Archery
Golf
Tennis
1936 — Riding
1937 — Outing Activities

1940 — Fencing
Badminton
1942 — Bowling

SCENE I—circa 1892. "The Delicate Creatures."

The story of women and their efforts to discover and define their place in the world is a long story with millions of chapters which have been lived by millions of women, each of whom asked her own questions and found her own answers in her own time. These answers are continually changing, and they will continue to change as each generation builds on the hopes, disappointments, aspirations, frustrations, accomplishments, and failures of the women who have gone before. This afternoon we shall review only one phase of the story. It deals with the efforts of thousands of women who have attempted to develop a philosophy, a set of principles, a body of policies, and an ever-changing set of practices related to the participation of girls and women in sports and athletics.

The beginning is lost antiquity. Probably it all began when a little cave girl ran to catch her brother and discovered that it was fun to run. Emulating her brother, she threw a rock into the river and discovered that it was fun to throw—fun to jump—fun to climb—to *compete!* But her father saw her running and competing like a boy and ordered her mother to make her return to the cave, which was the proper place for a girl. Perhaps her mother sighed in her heart, but she did as she had been commanded. The girl was not so easily daunted. She asked the age-old woman's question—the question we have heard every year of our teaching lives. *"Why?"*

But through the years the women who have known that it was fun for a girl to run and jump and compete, even as boys do, also knew in their own lives that girls are different from boys. They knew that "Why?" was not the proper question. In their wisdom they asked, "How? What? Where? Under what circumstances is it good for girls to play?" And gradually through the years they formulated, reformulated, modified, and remodified their concepts of "Desirable Practices in Sports for Girls and Women."

In 1893 the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education (which certainly needed advancing) was just eight years old. The concept of physical education as an essential part of education was just beginning to be formulated by American educators. What was then thought of as physical training was a composite of German and Swedish gymnastics with a dash of French from Delsarte to give variety to the apparatus work, calisthenics, and posture training. At this eighth meeting of our ancestors, the men were alarmed because women were beginning to climb on the gymnastic apparatus. Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick is speaking:

> *It seems to me that there are physiological reasons why women should not do the kind of apparatus work which is largely done by men, where the weight of the body is supported continuously by the arms. . . . The women—and those who are here who do such work will please excuse me—the women whom I have seen who excelled in apparatus work were, as a class, as I recall them, not the kind of women who seemed to me most womanly. Their shoulders were too heavy; and (I will admit that this is utterly unscientific, but simply from a man's standpoint,) their hips are too small.*

But Dr. Dudley Allen Sargent rose to defend the fair sex:

> *For a long time I shared the objections of a great many persons to heavy gymnastics for women. In my younger days I looked upon woman from perhaps a more romantic point of view than at the present time. They were such delicate creatures, I thought, it was entirely brutish to ask them to circle a bar, or to hold their weight between parallel bars. But accidentally some of them got to work, and I found that they began to develop a considerable degree of efficiency. . . . As far as the movements go, there is nothing in the line of gymnastics which some women cannot do with just as much readiness as some men, and I do not think that, outside of the so-called esthetic standpoint, there are any physiological reasons why women should not do most things that men do.*
>
> (Bless you, Dr. Sargent!)

And so it all began. Women donned their bifurcated pleated serge garments—and the men have been arguing about us ever since.

Music: "Bird in a Gilded Cage."
Stage: Enter two girls in 1893 costume. They perform the original "Smith routine."

So the girls in blue lifted their dumbbells, swung their Indian clubs, and performed their calisthenic drills. And perhaps to symbolize the fact that in the coming years women were going to turn a lot of old ideas topsy-turvy, they stood on their heads.

Music: End in SQUAWAAAAWK. . . .
Stage: One girl does head stand while other assists and keeps clothing from being disturbed. Bow and off.

Which recalls the classic story of the young lady who announced that she would "stand on her head or bust"—and did both!

Calisthenics was the order of the day, but quietly and with no fuss the movement toward athletics had begun. In 1895, at the tenth convention of the

AAAPE, Clara Baer reported that the girls of Sophie Newcomb College in New Orleans had invented a new game called "Newcomb." Well, at least it was a start in the right direction! And it *was* the first mention of athletics for women at any physical education convention.

To pay our respects to "the delicate creatures" who were strong enough to challenge the traditions of their times and get us started in the direction of athletics for women:

Will all women who ever did the Smith routine raise their hands?
All who ever performed on the parallel bars?
All who have hung by their hands from stall bars?
All who have ever played or taught Newcomb?
All who have ever stood on their heads?

Will those who *still can* stand on their heads please stand on their feet to receive our applause?

SCENE II—1899-1917. The Basketball Committee.

With the passing of the old century and the beginning of the new, there was a spirit of gallantry in the air as women began to get organized to break the stereotype of "the weaker sex" and speed the social evolution through which *females* were finally transformed into people. The girls still did calisthenics.

Music: "Bird in a Gilded Cage."
Stage: Two calisthenics girls enter and repeat the Smith routine.

But in 1892 James Naismith had nailed two peachbaskets to the walls of the gymnasium at Springfield College, and the history of sports for girls and women began in earnest.

Music: "On Wisconsin."
Stage: Enter two basketball players, passing, dribbling, shooting. Their fun turns to roughhouse, and they start pushing and shoving each other as the narration continues.

Eline von Borries has noted that:

> *Although actually originated for men, basketball had been taken over almost immediately as a game with possibilities for women. Experience, however, soon proved that modifications needed to be made in an effort to eliminate some of the roughness inherent in the men's game in order to make it suitable for girls and women. Every group or institution playing the game made—and in some cases published—its own adaptation of the rules, resulting in considerable confusion.*

What to do about it? Exactly what we've been doing ever since—appoint a committee.

Stage: Exit all four girls.

In 1899 four women began the long attempt to find the *right* rules for the feminine version of basketball: Alice Bertha Foster of Oberlin College, Ethel Perrin of Boston Normal School of Gymnastics, Elizabeth Wright of Radcliffe College, and Senda Berenson of Smith College. In 1901, the first Official Basketball Guide for Women was published in the Spalding Athletic Library Series. This great-great-grandmother of the guides we buy in such profusion each year was edited by Senda Berenson for the next sixteen years, and it was generally referred to as "Spalding's Rules." In 1905 the first permanent basketball committee was organized, with Miss Berenson serving as chairman.

In 1906, at the fifteenth annual convention of what was then called the American Physical Education Association, the first talks on athletics for girls were presented. Mary Butler of Cortland State Normal spoke on "Needs and Dangers of Athletics for Girls in Grammar and Secondary Schools," and Gertrude Dudley of the University of Chicago discussed "The Place of Athletics in Education of College Women." (I hear them now! I should be able to. We've been on those topics for more than 50 years!)

A few years later at the 1912 convention of the Midwest District, Blanche Trilling posted a notice of a meeting "for all interested in athletics for girls and women." Such a crowd came they had to move to a bigger room . . . then a still bigger room . . . and we've been moving to bigger and bigger rooms ever since this first convention meeting devoted solely to athletics for girls and women.

To honor the women who established the first women's rules for what is still our most popular team game for girls:

Will all of the students of Alice Foster, Ethel Perrin, Elizabeth Wright, and Senda Berenson please stand?

Will all who knew these women raise their hands?

Will all who played under Spalding's Rules raise their hands?

And now, hands up for everyone who has ever played basketball!

SCENE III—1917-1927. The Committee on Women's Athletics.

In 1917, World War I absorbed the efforts of women as well as men. Women put on military uniforms.

Music: "Over There."
Stage: Woman in uniform of 1918 marches in, salutes, executes a couple of facings and stands at attention.

They joined the Red Cross.

Music: Continues.
Stage: Red Cross nurse enters with triangular bandage which she puts on woman in uniform, then both exit.

And in 1920, women became *persons* by an act of Congress which ratified the 19th Amendment.

Music: "Yellow Rose of Texas."
Stage: Suffragette marches across holding "Votes for Women" placard, and exits.

In the wave of enthusiasm for *fitness*—which seems to accompany all of our wars—many states passed new laws which recognized that physical education had a legitimate and desirable place in the school curriculum.

At the meeting of the Council of the American Physical Education Association, held on January 6, 1917, President Burdick was authorized to appoint a Committee on Women's Athletics. Again quoting Eline von Borries:

> *The need for such a committee was apparent . . . because of the "insistent and increasing demands coming in from all parts of the country for assistance in solving problems in connection with the athletic activities of girls and women . . . which demonstrated the need for a set of standards based on the limitations, abilities, and needs of the sex" and different from the established rules and standards for men.*

Dr. Burdick appointed Elizabeth Burchenal of New York City, Elizabeth Bates of Brown University, Florence Alden of Baltimore Athletic League, Blanche Trilling of University of Wisconsin, Winifred Tilden of Iowa State College, Maude Cleveland of the University of California, plus two men—Dr. L. R. Burnett of Sargent School and Dr. E. A. Peterson of Cleveland Public Schools. It was not a committee on coeducation—many years were to pass before the Association could entertain *that* concept—but at least it was a coeducational committee!

At the twenty-fourth convention of APEA in April 1917, the newly created committee presented its first program. Florence Somers spoke on "Standardization of Athletics for Women," and another paper was presented by Augusta L. Patrick of the Newark Public Schools.

By 1922, five specific committees had been named to deal with basketball, hockey, soccer, swimming and track and field.

Music: "Take Me Out to the Ball Game."
Stage: Enter as sport is named, the two basketball girls, a hockey player, a soccer player, a swimmer, and a runner, each performing actions symbolizing the activity.

In 1924, moderate sports, in 1925 baseball, and in 1927 athletic games were added.

Music: Continues.
Stage: Baseball player joins group.

But of course some girls were still doing calisthenics, albeit with less enthusiasm.

Music: A few bars of "Bird in a Gilded Cage" as calisthenic girls enter, then into "On Wisconsin."
Stage: The two calisthenic girls walk across stage performing the Smith routine in lackadaisical fashion, looking on wistfully as the athletes form a circle, arms on shoulders, and give nine rahs for "Team, team, team." Exit all.

The successive chairmen of the Committee on Women's Athletics were Elizabeth Burchenal, 1917-21; Blanche Trilling, 1921-25; and Katherine Sibley, 1925-27.

But there were other groups also interested in women athletes, and the Committee on Women's Athletics did not always agree with their practices. In 1922, the Amateur Athletic Union sent a girls' track team to the Paris Olympic Games. There was quite a ruckus about this, and it ended with Mrs. Herbert Hoover calling a meeting. As a result a new organization was established, the Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation. Its purposes were to "protect girls from exploitation" and to "establish standards." It was a new organization, but the names are familiar: Blanche Trilling, Elizabeth Burchenal, and Helen McKinstry of Russell Sage College. The story of the Women's Division of NAAF is too long to tell today. It made its own contribution for 17 years, but it also added to the confusion, and in 1939 it was integrated into our present organization.

Will the students of Miss Burchenal, Miss Trilling, Miss Sibley, and Miss McKinstry please stand?

Will all who knew them raise their hands?

Please stand, too, all who wore a uniform in 1918.

And may we see the hands of all who ever competed in track and field; all hockey players; all swimmers; and all who have played baseball, softball, soccer.

And now the hands of all who have used the privilege of the 19th Amendment and voted regularly!

SCENE IV—1927-1932. The Section on Women's Athletics.

The years from 1927 to 1932 were confused and confusing years in our nation's history. The big boom . . . the big crash . . . "Happy Days Are Here Again" . . . "Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?" They were years of confusion for women in athletics, too. What was our place in the total picture? How could we best exert our influence? Who were we? What were we? And how could we get the men to see it our way?

Music:	"Yes, We Have No Bananas," followed by "The Music Goes Round and Round."
Stage:	Enter all sports participants from previous scene, milling around in stage, forming small groups, breaking up, forming new groups.

In 1927, Florence Somers, who was then chairman of the Women's Athletic Committee, applied to the APEA to have the *committee* recognized as a *section* in the Association. The debate about whether the Council of the APEA did or did not officially agree to give the committee section status will probably never be settled. The objection was that the APEA bylaws called for election of officers of sections on the floor of the convention—and the Women's Athletic Committee did not operate that way. The upshot of it all was that the Women's Athletic Committee began to *function as a section,* apparently in the status of having been neither officially recognized nor denied.

The women justified their difference in procedure on the grounds that the "Women's Athletic Section" was *different!* It was a year-round working body which made rules, edited guides, advised on policies and programs, and conducted research studies; and it was felt that this responsibility should be safeguarded by more elaborate election procedures than the casual election from the floor which then prevailed in Association section meetings. Obviously there was something to be said on both sides, and it was said with considerable emotion many times during the next four years.

To give the men their due, they had reason for being confused. Let Helen Hazelton, who did yeoman service throughout this period, tell it in her own words:

> *From 1927 to 1930 the original Committee on Women's Athletics called itself the Executive Committee of the Women's Athletic Section. At the meeting of the Women's Athletic Section at national conventions, two members-at-large were elected by the Section-at-large to be added to the Executive Committee. One of these members-at-large was chairman of program at the national meetings.*
>
> *The Executive Committee, made up of the chairmen of the activity subcommittees and members-at-large, elected a chairman at its annual meeting at Christmas time. This chairman—while nominally chairman of the Women's Athletic Section—continued the same sort of work as had always been done by the committee, and the program-making duties which were annually the sole responsibility of a Section chairman (in other sections of APEA) were put in the hands of a member-at-large who was elected from the floor at the time of the national meeting of the Women's Athletic Section. . . . This procedure was undemocratic . . . but it was the only way to maintain the efficiency of the rules-making committees.*

Do you have that all straight now?

While all of this was going on, perhaps to establish our own official status, the Official Ratings were established in 1928. Then volleyball was added to the list, and in 1930, winter activities.

Music: "Glow Worm."
Stage: Enter official, who blows whistle, and milling groups sit down on floor in orderly circle. Volleyball player, followed by winter activities girl enter, and circle is enlarged to make room for them. Then official again blows whistle and all rise and walk offstage in cohesive group.

But there were *more problems!* The women had money! And to quote Mabel Lee: "The general run of men who were disposed to quarrel with the women at this time apparently did not know of the treasury." But when they found it out, WOW! They seized upon this as still another great irregularity since no other section had a treasury of its own. The cry immediately was raised that the women should turn this treasury over to the APEA and the APEA should budget the committee's work. Miss Lee adds, "This gave the women deep concern."

In 1929 a small cruse of oil was poured on the troubled waters when the *American Physical Education Review* announced a new feature—a page devoted to athletics for girls and women!

In 1930-31 the basic problems were ironed out in the process of a complete reorganization of Association structure, policies, and procedures. And in 1931 Miss Lee became the first woman to hold the office of president of the American Physical Education Association. At long last the women of the Association had an official voice to speak for them in high places, and no voice has ever spoken more fervently and more persistently in behalf of women's athletics than the voice of Mabel Lee.

Please stand, Mabel Lee, to receive our applause.

Please stand with her, Helen Hazelton, and all of the women who served during the troubled years of 1927-32.

Stand with them, too, all students of Mabel Lee, Helen Hazelton, and Florence Somers.

And now a big whistle of appreciation from everyone who has ever tooted an official's whistle.

SCENE V—1932-1953. The National Section on Women's Athletics.

By 1932 the Depression had become very depressing. Many of us who had jobs were not getting paid; and many well-trained physical educators could find no teaching jobs. But we were getting organized just the same, although not without opposition.

Music: Medley of "Dixie" and "Yankee Doodle."
Stage: Enter all previously mentioned sports performers, each carrying a white cardboard square. With much shuffling about and trying of cards in different positions, right, left, down, up, etc., the performers finally form a pyramid with front line sitting, second line kneeling, third standing, and fourth with hands overhead. Official supervises this scene as narration continues.

In her role as president of APEA, Miss Lee found that:

> *. . . there were some men who were opposed to there being a Woman's Athletic Section at all, feeling there was no need for such a section. Others felt that the women "busied" themselves too much throughout the year and magnified the importance of their own group. . . . Some even resented having a woman president of the Association. . . . These men had to be*

placated . . . at least enough of them to carry a majority vote for the women's plans. If the plans for an NSWA were voted down now, it would be years before the women could ever get favorable action. The time was crucial.

Eventually the plans for a working organization to be known as the National Section on Women's Athletics were presented to the Association, and when the matter came to a vote, Miss Lee writes, "John Brown, Jr., jumped to his feet and launched into an impassioned speech insisting that the women be allowed the plans they desired," noting that if the APEA found the procedures objectionable after they had been tried out, they could later be changed. And so it came to pass that on April 20, 1932, the National Section of Women's Athletics was officially recognized as a working section of the American Physical Education Association.

Music: "Marching Along Together."
Stage: The two basketball players bring in a large NSWA organization chart placard and stand in front of pyramid, holding it between them. (On reverse side of this placard is an outline map of the United States to be used later.)

The outgoing chairman of the old debatable Section on Women's Athletics—or was it the Committee on Women's Athletics?—at any rate, Grace Jones presented the APEA with $200 from the old treasury saying that she "hoped the women's work would always prove an asset to the APEA." (And if she held her tongue in her cheek as she said it, surely no one here will call her to account.)

And thus began the development of what has been called by someone the 0-0-0 Section because it was the most overorganized organization the Association had ever seen. But it was effective overorganization that opened the way for widespread participation and commitment by women who believed in its purposes.

Under the chairmanships of Grace Daviess, Eline von Borries, Elinor Schroeder, Jane Shurmer, and Ruth Atwell, lacrosse, speedball, archery,

Music: Continues.
Stage: Participants in lacrosse, speedball, archery, golf, tennis, riding, fencing, badminton, and bowling enter as named and find places in the pyramid.

golf, and tennis were added in 1933, riding in 1936, outing activities in 1937, fencing and badminton in 1940, and bowling in 1942.

In 1936, NSWA instituted the effective use of state representatives, which carried NSWA into every corner of the USA.

Music: "Stars and Stripes Forever."
Stage: Turn organization chart placard over and bring USA map into view.

Just as we were beginning to roll along in fine style, it was 1941. The bombs fell at Pearl Harbor, and the officials' whistles blew "squads right!"

Music: Continues.
Stage: Enter four women in military uniforms of 1942, marching abreast. Official blows whistle, and the standing lines of pyramid fall in behind them in column of fours and continue marching.

Some of us were in USO or Red Cross, doing the hokey pokey.

Music: "Doing the Hokey Pokey."
Stage: Enter a woman in Red Cross uniform. She leads the front line of the pyramid in the hokey pokey.

Some of us were in industry.

Music: Continue "Hokey Pokey" with jerky vibrato.
Stage: Second line of pyramid simulates riveters.

And FITNESS was the watchword.

Music: "Oh, How I Hate to Get Up in the Morning."
Stage: All performers start doing toe touch, Burpee exercise, push-ups, sit-ups, etc. The two calisthenic girls come running out and start doing the Smith routine with great enthusiasm.

Wherever NSWA women went, they took their Guides with them—into the military services and into industry and recreational programs. In the far places where Red Cross girls carried on their invaluable services, they did a little missionary work with schools and women's groups on the side. And in our schools, thanks to the insistence of the women physical educators who stayed at home to keep on doing the essential job of teaching, the girls still played.

Music: "Trojan Marching Song" (Fight On for Old SC).
Stage: All sports performers enact their sport.

In 1945, we all returned to our schools and recreation jobs.

Music: Continues.
Stage: Led by military services, all performers file off the stage.

But life had changed for women and would never be quite the same again. We were now recognized as an indispensable part of the team, and the stage was set for further progress.

Under the chairmanships of Alice Shriver, Anna Espenschade, Martha Gable, Laurie Campbell, and Josephine Fiske we tackled the big job we had to do in many ways. We installed a paid secretary in the office of the Association, and she soon became one of the Association consultants. The working agreement with what had become the AAHPER was established in 1951, and the Section took over the publication of its own *Guides*. Meanwhile the Women's National Officials Rating Committee rolled up its sleeves and moved into industrial recreation, community recreation, and the semiprofessional leagues which were being formed in many areas. These were busy years for NSWA, and the four letters became so much a part of our lives that even now we cannot quite get them off of our tongues.

In remembrance of those 20 busy, confused, but highly constructive years:

Will all women who wore a uniform in World War II please stand?

Will the 10 women who served as chairmen of the Section during the years 1932 to 1953 please stand?

Will all past and present state and district representatives please raise their hands?

And will our one and only consultant please stand alone while all who have ever written a letter beginning "Dear Rachel Bryant" give her the applause she deserves?

SCENE VI—1953-1957. The National Section on Girls and Women's Sports.

And it grew and it grew and it grew.

Music: "Yes Sir! That's My Baby."
Stage: Enter all sports performers in close huddle, move to center of stage, then slowly expand huddle until it occupies most of stage. All carry white cards and continue to raise, lower, and move them about as they walk. (On six of the cards, a big letter N,S,G,W,A, or S is drawn on the reverse side of the card, to be used later.)

It took in more activities; it moved down into preadolescence and up to adulthood. Its name no longer described its scope and its function. So committees were appointed and arguments were argued, and in 1953 we changed our name to the National Section for Girls and Women's Sports. But the transition was not easily made, and our tongues slipped many times.

Music: "Mairsy Doats."
Stage: Performers with lettered cards step in front of stage and shuffle back and forth, getting the cards in several different orders. Finally the A card holder throws her card away and the others line up as NSGWS.

Now, altogether, let's get it *right!* N—S—G—W—S.

Music: "Yes Sir, That's My Baby."
Stage: All performers chant N—S—G—W—S, and continue with decreasing volume as they follow the A card holder offstage.

But what's in a name? That which we once called NSWA by any other name could smell as sweet—and have just as many thorns. Yes, we really got organized in 1953. The budget grew: we held the first big workshop in Estes Park; we got out more publications.

Who did it? You and you and you. You who believed that "the one purpose of sports for girls and women is the good of those who play"—you who were willing to implement that belief with energy, time, and *action*.

As we ask Chairmen Josephine Fiske, Aileene Lockhart, Grace Fox, and Mabel Locke to stand, will all the women who held office in the NSGWS please hold up their hands?

Now the hands of all who went to Estes Park?

And will those who can recite the infield fly rule hold up *both* hands.

SCENE VII—1957-1958. The Division for Girls and Women's Sports.

And now we have reached the years of our maturity. We have become full partners in the overall program of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. We have served our apprenticeship as a tentative Division of AAHPER, and before this convention ends we shall be recognized as a full-fledged *Division* of the Association. Our chairman will be a vice-president of the Association, sitting on the board of directors and elected by the representative assembly as a symbol of our expanding participation in all phases of Association concern, our expanding influence in areas other than girls and women's sports, and our expanding understanding of the complexity of the problems women and men must work through together.

As a Division of AAHPER we women are still marching on with our basket-

Music: "Glory, Glory Hallelujah!"
Stage: All sports performers enter, one by one, in the order named. They cross the stage, exit, drop their equipment and pick up hats and briefcases. Re-enter at back of stage and sit on floor in a double circle.

balls, our hockey sticks, our soccer balls, our swimming suits, our track and field equipment, our baseballs, our volleyballs, our winter activities, our lacrosse sticks, our speedballs, our archery bows, our golf clubs, our tennis racquets, our riding crops, our fencing foils, our badminton birds, and our bowling balls.

Music: Continues, transposed to minor key.
Stage: Performers carry on a silent meeting, with the official serving as chairman.

Carrying on, too, with our rule books, our standards, our philosophy, our publications, our official's ratings, our audiovisual aids, our international relations, our public relations, our publications, our research—never forgetting our operating codes and our finances.

Through the years we have done a lot of talking, sitting, talking, letter writing, talking, traveling, talking, and *meeting*. And what have we been

Stage: On hearing word *traveling*, basketball player jumps up and "travels," then sits down in confusion.

meeting about? Only one thing—"The good of those who play."

SCENE VIII—Desirable Practices.

(There is no break between Scene VII and Scene VIII)

Through the years we have been trying to keep up with social evolution, trying to keep up with the girls, trying to determine and establish "Desirable Practices for Girls and Women" in their sports and recreational activities.

Music: Medley made up of snatches of all songs used in previous scenes.

We talked about standards. Is it fair for girls to wear hatpins while playing hockey? How far shall a lady's skirt be allowed to dip on the hockey field?

Stage: Hockey player enacts these questions.

Shall we insist on medical examinations for all girls?

Stage: Bowling performer takes pulse, etc., on fencer.

Sometimes we had to compromise between reality and what we thought was ideal. We talked about competition. Are we for it? Are we against it?

Stage: Much head shaking, final shoulder shrugging, and slow nods of agreement. On competition questions, some nod in vigorous assent, others shake their heads in violent disagreement. Then handshakes all around, which become handpulls, and finally jerkaways.

What do we mean by competition? How many statements have we written? But that's all settled now, isn't it? Or is it?

We talked about rules. Shall the overhead shot in basketball count one point or two? Shall we use the one step, two step, or polka step? The single dribble, double dribble, or limited continuous dribble? Shall we play one court, two court, three court, or nine court basketball?

Stage: Basketball players act out shot from above shoulders, chest, below waist, one shooting, other guarding. Continue pantomime for all basketball questions.

We talked about policy. Shall girls be allowed to play touch football?

Stage: Soccer and speedball players demonstrate touch football. Horror expressed by many, nods of approval by a few.

We talked about *Guides*. Who shall publish them? About publications.

Stage: Continuous argument, rising to higher pitch with some clenched fists and knee pounding at mention of money.

We published the *Sportswoman*, the *Service Bulletin*, and fliers by the thousands.

We talked about money. Ah, yes, our reach has always exceeded our grasp—but what else is heaven for?

We talked about men.

Stage: Smiles, frowns, nods, headshakes.

We talked about alphabets, apostrophes, ofs, ons, and fors.

Music: "La Cucaracha."
Stage: Prompter hands nearest woman placard reading DIVISION, and next three women cards reading ON, FOR, OF. These three women shove each other around in rhumba rhythm, each trying to stand next to DIVISION. Finally, FOR wins, and OF and On walk off sadly. Prompter hands next woman a card reading GIRL. She takes her place next to FOR without dispute, as an APOSTROPHE and S jostle each other for the next spot. The APOSTROPHE is finally pushed aside. Next woman adds AND, the next WOMEN, followed by further jostling between APOSTROPHE and the next S. Finally both stay, making WOMEN'S, and then SPORTS joins the line without controversy.

But always, no matter what we argued about, we were genuinely concerned with "the good of those who play." And we shall go on talking about that, no matter what our structure, our squabbles, our name, because this is really the reason for our existence as an organization.

And now, as our performers stand before us showing us our new role as the Division for Girls and Women's Sports, let's give them a big, big hand.

Music: "Glory, Glory Hallelujah!" (major key).
Stage: Sports performers not holding cards join in applause as performers from the earlier scenes pass in review, then all bow, and exit.

SCENE IX—Preview of Tomorrow.

The players for this final scene are the many women who have given leadership to the cause of "the good of girls who play." Will those of you who are seated in the audience today please stand to receive our applause as some of your specific contributions are mentioned?

Our good friends who spoke for us on the board of directors when we had no official voice of our own—the women who have served as president of the Association: Mabel Lee, Mary Channing Coleman, Agnes Wayman, Margaret Bell, Anne Schley Duggan, Helen Manley, Ruth Evans, Bernice Moss, Ruth Abernathy, and President-elect Pattric Ruth O'Keefe.

Now the many, many women who have served on the national board of directors as vice-presidents of other divisions or as district representatives.

Our first vice-president for Girls and Women's Sports: Mabel Locke.

Our vice-president-elect: Jane Mott.

Now, all of the women who have in their time served as chairman of NSWA or NSGWS.

Then, some of the hardy perennials who have bypassed the chairmanship in their devotion to the many other jobs they have done so well: Bessie Rudd, Elizabeth Beall, Marion Purbeck, Gladys Palmer, Christine White, Marjorie Hillas, Dorothy Beatty . . . and others too numerous to name who are represented by them.

Our own Elsa Schneider, consultant in the Office of Education.

Our own Rachel Bryant, our one and only consultant at AAHPER headquarters.

Now, every woman who has ever served on the legislative board.

Every woman who has ever served on a standing committee.

And all women who have ever served on *any* committee at the national, district, state, or local level since 1899.

These are our leaders! Through their efforts the Women's Basketball Committee became the Committee on Women's Athletics, the Section on Women's Athletics, the National Section on Women's Athletics, the National Section on Girls and Women's Sports, and now the DIVISION FOR GIRLS AND WOMEN'S SPORTS.

Come, then, let us applaud ourselves! And then please be seated. Because there is still a more important group that must be honored: the girls who will build the *future* of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports, the girls who will determine whether we shall continue to grow in wisdom as well as in strength, the girls who are now *students* in our colleges and universities.

Stand, students, so we can see our *tomorrow!*

And now, as we move into the reception room to pay our personal respects to our leaders through the years, it seems appropriate that tomorrow's leaders should stand beside them. Will the students please step to the side aisle and come down to the front, each one offering her arm to one of our honored guests now seated in the front section?

Then, if Mabel Locke and Jane Mott and the members of the executive council will lead the way, followed by our honored guests and their student escorts, the rest of us will fall in behind in whatever order is convenient—for well-organized as we are, we women of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports need no further organization as we celebrate our own history of WOMEN IN ACTION.

Music: "Pomp and Circumstance" as the procession files out.

The "Woman's Look" in Sport (1959)

Whenever people assemble in a conference, we may assume they have certain common interests they want to discuss. In order to establish a frame of reference for those discussions, they usually invite someone to open the conference by identifying those interests in such a way that the attention of the conference participants is focused on what they all have in common rather than on personal, regional, or institutional differences. As I see it, that is my assignment this morning.

What are the unifying characteristics of the participants in this conference? First, you are all interested in sport, and probably each of you is a better-than-average performer in some sport; and second, all of you are young women. These characteristics affect your lives in many different ways, and they will tend to influence your thinking during this conference. So let's examine the implications of these characteristics before you begin your discussions.

You are all interested in sport, but your interests cover a wide range of sports activities. Some of you like ping-pong, which is played on a table in a small room; but others of you like golf, which is played outdoors on a course that covers several acres. Some like to swim and emerge cool and clean; while others prefer tennis, which makes you hot and sweaty. Some like bowling, in which you perform alone as you try to overcome an inanimate object; some like riding, performing alone to master the will of a large animal; while others prefer fencing, in which you perform alone in opposition to a human challenger. Some

---

Delivered at the annual convention, National Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women, Corvallis, Oreg., 1959.

choose badminton, in which partners oppose partners, two against two; while still others find your greatest fun in such team games as basketball in which six people coordinate their effort and strategy to overcome the opposition supplied by six other people engaged in similar cooperative efforts.

What do all these varied sports activities have in common? One of the best answers has been given by Roger Bannister, the great runner: "Sport is a diversion with no purpose beyond providing a testing ground larger than a chessboard but smaller than life itself." This is what all sports have in common. This is the fascination sports have for all of you.

All sports offer diversion, a change of activity, an involvement in something different from our daily occupations and preoccupations. This diversion may be found in all recreational activities; bridge, for example, can provide intense involvement in a challenging situation quite different from our workaday tasks. But sports offer an added incentive. They involve movement, which provides a change for the body as well as for the mind, and they offer the satisfaction that comes from the feeling of movement as a sensory experience.

But the real fascination of sports is not found in idle diversion. We are drawn to sports because they provide a testing ground on which we may determine our own abilities by attempting to overcome the resistance offered by another person, group of persons, or defined set of circumstances. Competition, itself, is inherent in many life situations; but seldom do we have an opportunity to compete openly, freely, fully, in situations where the purpose of the moment is defined as competition. In sports, during the time of play and within the rules of the game, we are morally committed to use all our resources against opponents—either persons or things—that are resisting our efforts. In that test, we find out what we can do and how we react to success, failure, and uncertainty; and this self-testing forces upon us a kind of self-evaluation in specific terms not often provided by other life situations.

The sports testing ground is larger than a chessboard or a bridge table. It involves the whole person, not only her mind and ego but also her muscles, bones, blood, nerves, blood vessels, heart, endocrine glands, liver, lungs, digestive tract, and every fiber of her being. But this testing ground is still smaller than life itself. It is a segment of life, circumscribed by rules within a limited space for a limited time. In one or two hours, within the limits of the playing field, the outcomes of the test will be decided in clearly definable terms, made explicit in the rules. And when the game is over, neither the success nor the failure will have any really drastic effect on the player's life. When the game is over, it is over—and we can return to the larger game of life refreshed by our brief release from its complexity and confusing imponderables.

Both the significance and the transient nature of sports achievement were recognized in the early Olympic games, when men honored their gods by offering them their best performances of feats of strength and skill. The winner in each event received a wreath of honor, but it was made of the leaves of the laurel tree that withered in an hour, symbolizing the belief that the significance of all athletic endeavors lies in the striving, in the doing, in the experience itself, and not in the final winning or losing. Outstanding performance in any endeavor was considered to be deserving of recognition, but such recognition was only for the moment. The winning athlete could not "rest on his laurels" forever; when the laurel wreath began to wither, it was time for him to move on to new experiences in the larger arena of life itself.

Any sport can satisfy our need for a diversion and a testing ground larger than a chessboard but smaller than life itself, but what determines our personal choices of specific sports? Individual abilities, yes—but not to so large an extent as we may think, for we are more persuaded by the availability of specific activities. If we live where there are mountains, we are more likely to choose skiing than hockey; if horses are part of our lives, we are more likely to choose riding than swimming. We do not learn to play tennis unless we have access to tennis courts, and we do not become fencers unless someone is available to teach us the fencer's art. Availability of facilities, access to instruction, and opportunities to see skilled performers largely determine what sports we try, and encouragement and some degree of early success influence our desire to continue trying to acquire greater skill. We are influenced, too, by the social significance attached to given sports in the communities in which we live. Ojai, California, is a "tennis town," for example, and so a child living in Ojai is influenced to choose tennis rather than softball because tennis is "the thing to do" in that community. Socioeconomic factors also influence our choices. If our parents belong to a country club, we are more likely to play golf; if our only playground is a vacant lot in a crowded city area, we may find our testing-ground on a roughed-out baseball diamond playing Move-up or One Old Cat.

All these chance factors are part of the culture in which you live, but by far the most significant factors in determining your choices within a culture are the time and place of your birth. The customs, mores, beliefs, and general attitudes that identify the culture of any group of people are never static. They change through the years, even as they differ from country to country throughout the world. And this is particularly true with reference to the kinds of choices available to women, especially during the past century.

If you had been born in this country a hundred years ago—about the time of the Civil War—you might have chosen to play a very ladylike game of croquet, in your whaleboned corset, with your floor-length skirts sweeping the grass and your hat firmly anchored to your hair by a long hatpin. Only the most daring of you would have ventured into the water, clad in voluminous bathing dresses and long black hose that covered every inch of your bodies, arms, and legs (then discreetly referred to as limbs). If you had been born in India or China or Russia, you would have grown up with different attitudes toward sports, even as you would have acquired different attitudes toward other aspects of your life, and your personal sports choices, if any, would probably have been different.

I have just finished reading a fascinating book called *The Cherished Goal*, written by a Russian girl. Now in her late 20s, she is one of the world's greatest women shot-putters. She was attracted to the shot-put when she was 13, and with considerable encouragement from the government she has been able to devote most of her time to developing her skill in this event. Other young women have been similarly encouraged to develop skill in the sprints, distance runs, hurdles, jumps, javelin, discus, and in gymnastic performance on the rings, parallel bars, high bar, and horse. To most of you, such devotion to these particular sports events seems incredible; but if you had been born in Russia you, too, might have found your personal testing ground on the running track or in the shot-put circle.

What, then, makes participation in a given sport desirable or undesirable for women? This is just one phase of the larger question, how do we determine what is "right" for girls and women in all areas of their lives? I wish I knew a simple answer to give you!

In general terms, the answer depends upon two things: first, the meaning given to the phrase "being a woman" as it is interpreted in the beliefs, customs, practices, and attitudes prevailing in any given culture at any given time; and second, each woman's personal needs and abilities as she interprets them in relation to the role she accepts within the culture in which she lives.

These statements are both very complex, but women are complex creatures, and cultural change has endowed them with even greater complexity than they naturally possess. Many women have tried to simplify these answers by shifting the burden of interpretation to the men in their lives, rephrasing the question to "What will the kind of man I want to marry approve of? What choices on my part will he be willing to accept?" Personally, I think this only confuses the issue! History shows us that most of the changes in the lives of women have preceded rather than followed men's acceptance of them. But certainly there is no doubt that our interpretations of what we think men think is a strong factor in our decisions.

However, we also know that men, like women, are capable of changing their attitudes and interpretations through the years. During the past 50 years, many women have done many things of which their grandfathers would not have approved, but their male contemporaries still find them attractive, desirable, and feminine. On the other hand, some women have alienated themselves from masculine approval by behaving in ways men find unattractive. An examination of some of these changes and ways of behaving may give us some clues to what makes sports participation "desirable" or "undesirable" for young women like you, who live in the United States in the second half of the 20th century.

You have many privileges your grandmothers did not have. You have the right to vote and participate in the political life of your country; you have the privilege of working for money outside your home by choice as well as from necessity; and general acceptance of the belief that women and girls may enjoy participating in active sports is demonstrated by your conference here, today. These privileges were not acquired suddenly or by accident. Each marks the culmination of a long struggle against the traditional belief that the word "person" refers only to men.

When the U.S. Constitution was written, there was no statement in it referring to women. None was needed. Everyone took it for granted that the rights and privileges guaranteed to persons and citizens belonged only to men, because women were not then considered to be "persons"; they were "only females." And so on a memorable election day in 1872 when Susan B. Anthony challenged this traditional belief by attempting to enter a polling place to cast a vote, she was arrested, tried, and fined for "breaking the law"—solely on the grounds that she was a female. Forty-eight years later, in 1920, the 19th Amendment was added to the Constitution to change this interpretation. It was done in a somewhat backhanded way by stating, "The rights of citizens . . . shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex." The wording was ambiguous, but the implications were crystal clear. Henceforth women were to be accorded the rights of citizens. "Females" had been officially recognized as "persons" by an Act of Congress.

Aside from telling you something about your historical background, this story illustrates a very important point. In 1872, men believed so firmly that women should not vote that they put a distinguished lady in jail for trying to do so. By 1920, they were sufficiently convinced of the error in previous male beliefs reluctantly to accord women the right to vote and hold office. Today, in 1959, they no longer question our right to vote as persons and citizens; they even chide us at times because we do not fully avail ourselves of our voting privileges. What was considered "wrong" for women in 1872 is not only "right" for women in 1959, it is also considered "desirable."

In the business world, there was no Act of Congress to give official recognition to the fact that women as persons were also competent workers. Women entered man's world of paid employment one by one, each woman having to make her own decision to brave the disapproval she might incur from the men in her life. And so it has been, too, in what was once the man's world of sports. Women athletes did not exchange their trailing skirts and hatpins for white cotton shorts in one dramatic moment of transformation. They edged into sports rather gingerly, moving slowly from one innovation to the next—always with one eye on the men they hoped to marry to see how far they could go without being ostracized.

But as a result of these daring feminine invasions into the once masculine realms of business and sports, beliefs about women and attitudes toward them have undergone many changes during the 20th century. Today in the United States it is generally recognized that voting, working, and playing are human privileges, not restricted to either sex. But this recognition has not blurred the unchangeable fact that men and women are different kinds of human beings. Today the important question is, How should the important differences between men and women modify the behavior of male and female human beings as they vote and work and play? The answer to that question is now being formulated by women like you, as you weigh and evaluate your own behavior in relation to your own interpretation of your role as female human beings.

When women first entered the man's world of paid employment, the only model they had to follow was the one that had been set by men. So in the early days many women believed that the way to succeed was to copy the men's model. They copied men's suits, their shirts, even their neckties—and adopted a frozen-faced brusque manner. But women are not men, and when people try to be something they are not, they make themselves ridiculous. They were not even good carbon copies of their models; they were caricatures of the men they tried to imitate. Men did not admire these cartoons of themselves. They ridiculed them and avoided them outside their offices, but they kept on hiring them because they were useful.

As women got used to being in the man's world which had now become a woman's world, too, they felt less need to prove that they were "like men" and became more like themselves. They softened their tailored suits into feminine dressmaker models and discarded the stiff collars and neckties. As their manner also softened, they did not revert to tea-table manners or the coyness of flirtation; instead they developed a new way of behaving that was appropriate to the business situation while still being characterized by the feminine qualities of graciousness, pleasantness, and courteous consideration of other people.

In the process of adapting themselves to the business world, women learned two important lessons. They discovered that they could win the respect of men no matter what job they did, as long as they did that job well; and they found to their delight that no matter what job they did, they would still be liked and loved as women as long as they looked and acted like the attractive women they were. Today the "woman's look" is an essential part of the business and professional world; and certainly the fact that a young woman has a job does not make her seem less desirable to the kind of man she hopes to marry!

As the "woman's look" has developed in business, the ways in which the important differences between men and women modify their working lives have become increasingly evident. This is too long a story to tell here, but in general it may be said that women have discovered they are best adapted to certain kinds of employment, most of which are now identified as "women's fields." Within those fields, it is evident that most women are not competing *against* men but rather have found ways to work *with* men in the complex business world, and they have developed working patterns that include their homes, husbands, and children. There are some exceptions to this generalization. Some women have found and will continue to find success, satisfaction, and acceptance in jobs usually performed by men. On the job they compete with men on equal terms, neither asking for favors nor offering them. And, it is significant to note, this does not seem to bar them from happy and successful marriages. But within the framework of our own culture at the present time, it now appears evident that most working women—which includes most of the women of your generation—will find greater satisfaction and more complete acceptance of themselves as women by choosing their jobs in a "woman's field."

The modern "woman's look" in sports has been compounded out of the same elements of innovation, mistakes, and modifications. Much that was considered "wrong" for your grandmother is now "right" for you, and many activities that seemed "undesirable" for your mothers have become so "desirable" that they are taught to you in college.

In athletics, as in business, the early women competitors took men for their models, and a few girls still do. But the girls who dressed like men, walked like men, and shouted and swore like men did not prove that men and women are alike. They only underlined the fact that men and women are different. Most of these caricatures who made a travesty of the very goal they sought—the right to participate in sports—have now vanished. They have been replaced by attractive women wearing feminine clothes designed to give them freedom to move. Voluminous bloomers have given way to shorts, and year by year the shorts have become shorter—but they are not men's shorts. Hair has been cut short for convenience, but these short coiffures are not men's haircuts. Girls shout as they play, but they do not shout in men's voices. Today's feminine athletes play hard and to win, but they play like women. They have learned to be gracious in victory and good-humored in defeat, and they have brought to the sports arena the belief that people are more important than scores and friends more important then trophies. When the game is over, they take their showers, put on fresh make-up, and don their feminine blouses, skirts, and sweaters, ready to meet their opponents as the friends they are—friends who have offered them their best efforts on the cooperative testing-ground of competition.

The second lesson women in business had to learn was that they could be respected as workers only if they did the job well. And this, too, has been true in the world of sports. Girls who play awkwardly, fumble the ball, don't know the rules, or try to be "cute" on the playing field are not admired by either women or men. They, too, are caricatures, cartoons of women as athletes, and men make fun of them both privately and publicly. But girls who play well can become hot, sweaty, and red in the face and still be admired, because any skilled performance is always beautiful, and men respect skilled performers.

In sports as in business, women have also discovered that they are more successful in certain types of games and less well adapted to others. Out of the long list of activities in which men participate, women have gradually selected those that seem best suited to the interpretation of what "being a woman" means in the cultural pattern of the United States. They have taken these "women's sports" and modified them to suit their needs, establishing both their own rules and their own feminine standards of competition, which differ from the men's rules and standards in many ways. But just as some exceptional women in business have found satisfaction working in so-called "men's jobs," so we must recognize that women can enjoy putting the shot, hurling the discus, running the high hurdles, and performing gymnastic feats. If they enjoy doing these things and are able to do them well, there is nothing "wrong" about doing them, even though our particular cultural interpretation may not include them in the list of sports considered "desirable" for women.

Within our own "women's sports" and women's pattern of competition, both the range of sports and the intensity of competition have greatly increased during the past 20 years. This expansion has raised many new questions about what practices are "desirable" in feminine competition. The answers to these questions affect the programs of your WAA's, WRA's, and URA's—and much of your discussion at this conference will be concerned with them. But as you debate the questions related to interscholastic competition, national tournaments, and co-recreation, I hope you will find a few moments to consider a much more complicated question that underlies your whole interpretation of yourselves as persons and sportswomen.

I think we are past the point of arguing about whether or not girls should "play to win." Of course they should, for this is the very essence of sportsmanlike conduct: to honor your opponent by offering her your best efforts in the contest you have agreed to wage, both committed to use all of your resources within the rules of the game. If either contestant does less than this, she is guilty of unsportsmanlike conduct. She is "throwing the game," making a travesty of the spirit of competition by giving her opponent points she has not earned. And what meaning does a score have when one opponent "fixes it" by adding or subtracting points at will? If there are differences in skill, they can be openly recognized at the outset by establishing a handicap, and then both players can enjoy the exhilaration of "going all out," using their best efforts in truly sportsmanlike play.

Good sportswomen know what sportsmanship means, and when they play with other sportswomen, they engage in the contest wholeheartedly. But what happens when they play against men in what we have come to call co-recreation? Do they still play an equally honest game? Or do they confuse the purpose of the game with some private estimate of the effect that winning or losing may have on their male companion-opponent? Do they sometimes argue, "If I win the game I may lose the man"? Does this argument justify the unsportmanlike conduct of "throwing the game" by playing below their own top level skill?

Yes, I know the other side of the question, too. But I think we need to consider two other important questions first. What kind of a person am I? What kind of a man do I want to marry?

Am I the kind of a person who cheats to accomplish my own purposes? Is dishonesty in such a small thing as a game of tennis a good basis for a lifelong relationship? If this man will accept the thinly veiled insult of being given points he has not earned—if he is such a poor sport that he will sulk if he loses a game—how good a marriage risk is he?

Perhaps you can win your man by pretending to lose the game, but doesn't a marriage founded on pretenses, cheating, and unsportsmanlike conduct rest on very shaky foundations? Pretense in tennis can commit you to a lifetime of "playing pretend" in the hope of being loved for what you are not rather than for what you are. So why not take a chance? You may lose a date or two by playing an honest game, but you may also win a good sportsman for a husband—and that kind of man is worth waiting for!

The old belief that men must always surpass women in everything rested on the false belief that women were not really people. Today, both men and women know that they are, and they know that sports ability is not restricted to either sex. Perhaps this fact is not yet fully accepted by either men or women—but neither have all people yet accepted the fact that human ability is not limited by race, color, creed, or "previous condition of servitude." Yet everywhere in the world good sportsmen and sportswomen are making important contributions to the development of the attitudes of democracy, not only in sports but in work and in marriage as well. I think attractive girls like you can well afford whatever risks there may be in playing an honest game in the hope of furthering the development of those attitudes.

I cannot promise you a husband who will love you for what you truly are, but I can point out that history shows that most women's fears about the consequences of behaving like honest persons have proved groundless. Men resisted the idea of women in the business world; but today's successful businesswomen are no less desirable to men seeking a mate than their grandmothers were. So, too, many men resist the *idea* that any woman can surpass them in sports; but there is no evidence that good sportswomen lack for suitors. Rather, when they use their sports skills within the framework of truly gracious and womanly behavior, this seems to make them more, rather than less, attractive to the kind of men they want to marry.

There never have been any really easy answers to any of the important questions about human beings and their relations with each other. Both the questions and the answers have changed many times through the years, and they will continue to change in the years to come. But in conferences like this one, young women such as you will help to shape the answers that are most valid for college women living in the United States in the present moment of history—and in part for all women of all countries in the future.

So what is the "woman's look" in your time? As I see it represented in the conference, I believe it has two identifiable aspects linked together in the phrase, "She is a good sportswoman." As a good sport, she plays the game well and she plays it as a game, respecting both the rules and the spirit of the game that provide her with a diversion that serves as a testing ground, larger than a chessboard but smaller than life itself. As a woman, she looks like a woman, acts like a woman, and has established her own friendly, gracious, honest, and womanly pattern of sports participation. And so she has brought to the world of sport and the world of women a new look, the look of the 20th century woman who is every inch a person, a sports-loving person, an attractive, feminine person, a lovely person who is lovable and therefore greatly loved.

V
Propositions

The Conservative-Liberal Debate (1962)

I have been asked to examine the educational opinions of Russell Kirk, Mortimer Smith, Peter Viereck, and Clinton Rossiter—commonly known as "The New Conservatives." But I must begin by attempting to define conservatism, because we must identify the roots of conservative thought before we can hope to understand the "new" branches that seem to be growing from its body.

While there is some merit in the observation that conservatives look to the past for their values while liberals look toward the future, this generalization is not too helpful to our understanding. It suggests only a kind of congenital scoliosis that twists some heads to the right and others to the left. Neither is the generalization that conservatives resist change while liberals try to hurry it along entirely tenable. Conservatives, both old and new, devote much of their writing to recommendations for changes in education and the social order, while liberals are often vociferous in their opposition to proposed changes in the social order as well as in education. So we must dig a bit deeper to uncover the roots that give rise to opposite scolioses.

The basic assumption undergirding all conservatism, as I understand it, is that some permanent and definable system of human values exists and that it is known to men. Essentially, this value structure is authoritatively established, but there are differences of opinion about the source of this authority and about the historic social order in which the sanctioned values were most clearly exemplified.

Delivered at the History and Philosophy Section, AAHPER Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1962.

Thus, conservatives tend to deal with absolutes, and this may account for the pessimistic tone of much of their writing. Human institutions seldom, if ever, achieve the perfection implied by an absolute standard; accordingly, conservatives must always feel frustrated by societal inability to achieve their absolute goals. And since conservative arguments must be validated by an appeal to authority, it is understandable that conservative eyes are often focused on the historical past in which they find their authoritative standards best exemplified.

In contrast, the basic assumption of liberalism—again as I understand it—is that human value systems evolve within the context of man's ongoing attempts to understand the nature of the universe in which he exists. Essentially, all liberal value structures must be described as composites of relative values; but the several branches of liberalism differ about the relative importance of various values they perceive within the total value structure at any give time.

Since the beliefs of liberalism draw their validity from an ever-changing body of knowledge, liberal value structures are always subject to modification by new ideas. Thus, liberals have no solid foundations upon which they can rest their beliefs, and their position is accordingly less secure than the conservative position seems to be. Perhaps this lack of foundation accounts for the fervor with which liberals expound their beliefs, for in a sense, they must always convince themselves as well as their opponents. And since the liberal position is always a tentative position that can be validated only by the outcomes of social experimentation, it is understandable that their eyes are focused on the future.

In this context, then, we may examine the educational recommendations of the self-styled new conservatives by trying to discover the sources of their authority and the social order in which they believe those authoritative standards were most nearly achieved.

As I read the writings of the new conservatives in the light of educational history, I find a remarkable similarity between their recommendations and the doctrines formulated by John Locke. In the guise of "educational disciplinarianism," Locke's doctrines guided the education of the children of 17th century "gentlemen" and landowners. These doctrines also provided the foundation for virtually all educational practices in the early days of public education in the United States.

Educational disciplinarianism has many facets, but insofar as physical education is concerned, its most consequential assumption is that the body and mind belong to two different orders of reality—the body being physical, the mind metaphysical. Within these assumptions of mind-body dualism, Locke was never able to locate or describe the mind in categorical terms, but he compared it with a blank tablet upon which knowledge and habits could be inscribed with the stylus of mental discipline. Thus, he interpreted the central purpose of education as the disciplining of the mind by engraving upon it the knowledge and habits of thought that would contribute to the development of man's rational powers, narrowly defined.

Locke did not ignore the body. We are indebted to him for the inscription that appears over the entrances to many of our gymnasia: "A sound mind in a sound body is a short but full description of a happy life." So Locke urged his young gentlemen to exercise their bodies; but within the context of his beliefs about the metaphysical-physical distinction between mind and body, he did not consider the body susceptible to education, as such. Although he approved of wholesome play as a worthy use of leisure time, he did not include games in his educational curriculum.

With minor variations, Locke's interpretation of the physically based values of exercise and recreation is paralleled in the the attitudes of the new conservatives. But this does not imply that all conservatives are necessarily mind-body dualists. The belief that man is a natural form of life with no supernatural or metaphysical attributes can be sustained within the structure of conservative thought, and the dualistic hypothesis is not necessarily incompatible with the assumptions of liberalism. So all I am saying is that the educational recommendations of the new conservatives appear to rest on Locke's educational doctrines and that any interpretation of them must take this dualistic foundation into account.

During recent years, many American educators have abandoned the assumptions of mind-body dualism in favor of the unifying concept of "the whole child." But many have found it difficult to implement this concept within the context of their own inherent dualism. Thus, they may welcome the "whole child" into their classrooms but still separate his "mind" from his "body" in their teaching. Nonetheless, much contemporary theory—and some educational practice—does reflect the belief that "the whole child" is in fact a unitary organism, or at least a unified one.

Educational theory and practice in the United States has thus become a hybrid form that grows from two sets of philosophical roots. To some extent it exhibits the characteristics of each parent, but it does not fully realize the potentialities inherent in either parental stock. Inevitably, then, everyone is disappointed in its character; and the dualists among us must criticize its unitary tendencies, while the unitarians must find fault with its dualistic aspects. Accordingly, educators must carry on their work in an atmosphere charged with conflict, subjected to continual criticism from both camps—which is to say that a lifetime of stress is the normal lot of all who seek to educate the young.

In a totalitarian society the stresses of opposition may be resolved by silencing one group of critics and endorsing the opinions of the other group. But in a democratically oriented society both groups have the right to express their beliefs and the right to try to push all social institutions in the directions indicated by those beliefs. And who among us would wish it otherwise?

Turning now to the question of action, how shall physical educators react to the criticisms offered by the new conservatives or, for that matter, by conservatives and liberals of all varieties? Being of the liberal persuasion, I must give you a liberal's answer—which may also merit conservative consideration.

The physiological psychologists tell us that the effects of stress on the human organism can be either destructive or constructive. If we interpret stress as a nonrational force that seeks to destroy us without reason, we tend to adapt to that stress in paranoid ways that lead to our destruction. But if we can interpret that stress in rational terms, we can adapt to it in ways that further our own healthy emotional development. Accordingly, it seems to me that the future of physical educational depends on our ability to interpret criticism in rational terms so that we may act in ways that will contribute to our own health and growth.

When criticism directed against any area of education reflects essential differences in beliefs about the nature of man and the sources from which men derive their value structures, there is nothing to be gained by bickering about the rightness or wrongness of the practices that implement those beliefs. Thus, if a man honestly believes that the earth is flat, he cannot be persuaded that a great circle route that crosses the Polar icecap is the shortest distance between Copenhagen and Los Angeles. In short, the arguments of global men simply do not make sense to the men of flatland, or vice versa.

What, then, is the alternative to paranoia on the one hand and futile bickering on the other? I believe the privilege of living in a society that guarantees me freedom of belief carries with it my responsibility for knowing what I do believe, why I believe it, and how those beliefs can best be expressed in action. And I believe the privileges of freedom obligate me to act in those ways. And so I believe that every educator—either physical or mental, if he chooses to describe himself in those terms—is obligated to identify his beliefs about the nature of man, his body, his mind, and the values that give meaning to his human life. And I believe he is further obligated to act out those beliefs by putting them into practice and evaluating the outcomes that stem from those practices. In short, I believe that physical educators are obligated to push all social institutions, including physical education, in the directions indicated by their beliefs—in full recognition of the fact that men who disagree with them feel this same sense of obligation.

Surely, physical educators who do this will always meet with opposition from some and with encouragement from others. But by acting in ways that implement their own beliefs, they are attempting to resolve the stresses inherent in a democratically oriented society in a rational—rather than a paranoid—way, and thus they are contributing to the healthy development of that democracy as well as to their own emotional health and the health of the social institution called physical education.

And, as a liberal, I find it encouraging to remember that when the global men stopped arguing and actually flew the great circle route—thus demonstrating that it was not only feasible but profitable for men to assume that the world was round—some of the flatland men were persuaded to change their own beliefs about the shape of the earth.

Dynamics of Change (1969)

In this speak-out I have been assigned the task of focusing your attention on some of the propositions educators have considered in years gone by, with a view to focusing your best thinking on some of the propositions now before us. So I shall take my text, as I often do, from the poetic works of Wallace Stevens and begin by reminding you that—

Life consists
Of propositions about life. . . .

And so it is with education and with the special breed of education called physical.

The whole quotation reads this way:

Life consists
Of propositions about life. The human
Revery is a solitude in which
We compose these propositions, torn by dreams,
By the terrible incantations of defeats,
And by the fear that defeats and dreams are one.

And so it will be with this speak-out, as we argue with each other about the implications of our current propositions—torn by dreams, by the terrible incantations of defeats, and by the fear that defeats and dreams are one.

Delivered at the Physical Education Division Speak-Out, AAHPER convention, Boston, Mass., 1969.

And so it was in 1892, when the very life of the recently organized American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education was almost snuffed out by "the battle of the systems."

In 1892, the hopes and dreams of a very diverse lot of physical educators were invested in three diverse propositions about the purposes, objectives, and methodologies of the kind of education called physical. One of these propositions had been formulated in Sweden, one in Germany, and one in France; each had its own hard-core proponents in the United States and even more hard-core and vocal opponents.

Thus, in 1892, everyone was shouting and no one was listening and it seemed to many observers that the infant Association was bound to split into three splinter groups, each intent on trying to force its own will on the course of American education. But fortunately, a marvelous thing happened. One man, who was fully familiar with the terms of all three European propositions, turned his back on the controversies of yesterday and raised a new set of questions about today and tomorrow.

Putting away his own anger, Dudley Allen Sargent courteously paid his respects to all three European propositions, noting that each system was fully effective in accomplishing its stated objectives. Then he began to talk about the task of composing a new proposition about an American kind of physical education that might better accomplish the objectives and purposes of education in a new country, which was even then developing its uniquely American philosophy of education.

Dr. Sargent and his like-minded colleagues brought their own understanding of the purposes and objectives of American education to bear on the question, What kind of physical education can best accomplish the hopes and dreams of American educators? So they turned away from the "formal" European systems and toward the "natural" and "individual" approaches that still undergird much of our thinking about American physical education.

However, in 1892, and for many years thereafter, virtually all American educators—including Dr. Sargent—honestly believed that the "thinking mind of man" existed as a "mental essence" that was somehow housed in the "active body" but was not a part of it. Thus, virtually all educators—including Dr. Sargent—subscribed to the import of the famous dictum uttered by René Descartes, *Cogito ergo sum:* I think, therefore I am. (In education, this was sometimes translated as "The mind is the be-all and end-all of education.")

In contrast, it was commonly believed that the substantial body of man—

which clearly resembled the bodies of all animals—could and did perform all the functions that animals were able to perform. Thus, like any animal, the animal body of man could sense, perceive, feel, and move; and it was often said that sensation, perception, feeling, and movement were "known to the body" but "not known to the mind." Also, like any animal, the animal body of man could be trained or conditioned to function in specified ways; but obviously it could not be "educated," because only "the mind" was susceptible to modification by education. In contemporary terms, in 1892 the cognitive processes were assigned to a "mental essence" or "ghostly mind," and the affective processes, the motor processes, and all physiological processes were assigned to the substantial animal body.

Thus, in 1892 it appeared that educators who were primarily concerned with the body and its bodily processes had little in common with the "real" educators, concerned with the mental processes of the ghostly cognitive mind. And so the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education did not find it expedient to associate itself with any of the professional organizations being founded by "real" educators who were intent on educating "the mind."

All forms of art education were similarly relegated to nonmental status, largely on the ground that art is perceived by the senses (which, you will recall, were "known to the body" but not to the cognitive, rational, and presumably logical processes of the "mental essence"). This distinction between "mental processes" and "bodily and sensory processes" was also embodied in a distinction between *academic* and *nonacademic* areas of study and education.

In 1914, which happens to be the year in which my own "animal body" carried its "mental essence" to school, educators were devoting most of their efforts to an attempt to transfer their academic knowledge to the minds of their pupils, but in a nonacademic way, they were also concerned with training and conditioning the sensory, motor, and other bodily processes. So from time to time they enriched the mental curriculum of *cogito ergo sum* with snatches of sensory and bodily training, which I shall refer to as *sentio* and *actio*—or perhaps *movio*.

In the interests of *sentio*—I sense or I feel—they gave me a taste of "art training." I used my animal body to sing songs, beat out rhythmic patterns, and draw pictures of apples, daisies, and tomatoes—all of which was supposed to affect or express my affective feelings in some mysterious way known to my "bodily senses" but not to my cognitive "mind."

In the interests of *actio* or *movio*—I act or I move—they permitted my substantial and very physical body to move about in exercises, play, and games;

and it was assumed that these movements improved the functioning of my bodily machine. Presumably my cognitive mind was not involved in all this, except to the extent that it was conceded that "a sound body" was less likely to interfere with the functioning of "a sound mind."

Then, a few years later, largely at the behest of John Dewey, I was permitted to take typing and home economics and other courses in which I acquired certain "skills" that might enable me to earn my living as a useful and productive citizen. But there was always some question about giving academic credit for those courses, which involved the concept of *facio*—I fashion, I make, I produce. Those questions also hinged on the question of whether the skills I was learning were "bodily skills" or "mental skills."

Thus, American physical education and I grew up together within the confines of an educational philosophy that may be described as a mish-mash of dualism, idealism, realism, and pragmatism; and within this mish-mash all educators—including physical educators, art educators, and useful skills educators—tacitly accepted the long-standing distinction between the "mental processes" of the cognitive mind and the "sensory, affective, motor, and physiological processes" of the substantial body.

In 1930, when the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education became the American Physical Education Association, this mind-body distinction was still tacitly accepted by virtually all physical educators, including those who attempted to bring physical education into the realm of "real" or mental education by talking about the concept of "education *through* physical education" as distinguished from the concept of "education *of* the physical body." And thus the Association moved into its second great internal battle, between the proponents of *through* and the proponents of *of*.

The proponents of *through* argued that much "real" or "mental" education could occur on the playground, and they sought entrance into the realm of "mental education" by stressing concomitant learnings that could be defined in mental rather than in motor or physiological terms. The proponents of *of* conceded the value of such concomitant mental learnings but urged that they should not be pursued at the expense of motor learning and physiological conditioning, which in their opinion were the unique province of physical education. But despite repeated assertions of the hypothesis that "physical education is a part of education," neither the proponents of *through* nor the proponents of *of* really questioned the proposition that the mind and the body operate on different educational wavelengths, both in and out of the classroom.

Nonetheless, by 1937, it was agreed that physical educators did have something in common with mental educators, and so the American Physical Education Association affiliated itself with the National Education Association, and, in the following year, certain distinctions among health education, physical education, and recreation were recognized by christening this new department of the National Education Association with the name it now bears, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. In time this Association was subdivided into several divisions, including the Division of Physical Education.

Now, in 1969, we are questioning all these organizational relations, and we are also questioning the mental-physical relation that was tacitly accepted in 1937. During the past three decades the age-old concept of a nonphysical "mental essence" has been blown to bits by a great explosion of knowledge. Today, virtually all scientists and all educators are persuaded that human consciousness is firmly rooted in the very grounds of man's physical being, and they are convinced that there is no break within the complex continuum that includes sensory perception, feeling, emotion, cognitive thinking, bodily action, and behavior. Today, virtually all scientists and educators are also persuaded that human beings use all their faculties in their ongoing attempts to "make sense" out of their perceptions of themselves and their surroundings. They are also persuaded that all these faculties enter into the "learning process" that implements every educator's attempts to educate "the whole child." And so they are persuaded that the process of "learning to move" cannot be distinguished from the process of "learning to read" or "learning to see, to hear, to feel, and to think." Neither do they make any distinction between "moving to learn" and "sitting still to learn."

And so I must ask you, how does the sense that is engendered by the act of moving differ from the sense man makes out of his awareness of any other human behavior? How do the sensations, perceptions, feelings, thoughts, and actions that are experienced in a physical education class differ from those experienced in a sedentary classroom? In short, how does the kind of education called "physical" differ from any other kind of education?

Old educational philosophies—and old philosophers—die hard; long after their vital assumptions have crumbled into dust, the ghosts of those assumptions linger to haunt our speech, our habits of thought, our ways of feeling, our teaching methods—and our teaching credentials. But within the years of my lifetime, countless scientists, philosophers, and educators have composed what Wallace Stevens called "a new text of the world." To give you the whole quotation,

A new text of the world,
A scribble of fret and fear and fate,

From a bravura of the mind,
A courage of the eye. . .

A text of intelligent men
At the center of the unintelligible. . . .

That text eradicates all the invidious distinctions between the so-called mental processes and the so-called bodily processes, and thus it opens the way to a reconsideration of every proposition about the processes of "learning to move" and "moving to learn."

The new generation of physical educators now serving their time as undergraduate and graduate students dig that brave new text. I also dig that text, and I think that most of you do, too, even though you may at times be haunted by the ghosts of our dualistic ancestors.

Those ghosts will haunt every one of us for many years to come. They will tend to make us defensive of the past as we enter into our discussion of the propositions that are now before us. But perhaps, like Dudley Allen Sargent, we may find it possible to put away our angry defenses, pay our courteous respects to the propositions put forth by our ancestors, and then move on to the task of composing a new proposition about a kind of physical education that might better accomplish the objectives and purposes of education, as we understand them in our own time.

I think we can. I hope we will.

People Make Ideas Happen (1970)

A few months ago I received a letter and a short questionnaire from a man who said he was writing a book about "the changing scene in education." He needed information about any changes that might have happened in physical education during the past 50 years.

The first page of the questionnaire raised the usual questions about age, sex, education, and professional experience of the questionnaire respondent. We might skip these details, but just for the record I told him I was born in Illinois in 1908, and eventually I graduated from Joliet Township High School, Joliet Junior College, and the University of Chicago—with majors in mathematics and English and a one-unit course in "natural dance" taken during my first year at Joliet Junior College. Professional experience? Here I listed six years of high school teaching in English, mathematics, and physical education; six years at the University of Iowa, where I made up my undergraduate deficiencies in physical education and earned an M.A. in physical education and a Ph.D. in child welfare while working as a secretary and research assistant; then two years as assistant professor of hygiene at Wellesley College and 29 years as professor of physical education at the University of Southern California. That adds up to 43 years of being involved in "the changing scene in physical education," so I felt qualified to fill in the rest of the questionnaire.

But before we go into the changes in our own field, I want to tell you about another educational revolution that began in my home town about 60 years ago.

Delivered at the opening session, annual convention, Illinois AHPER, Chicago, 1970.

In 1912, the teachers of Joliet Township High School became concerned about the fact that many of the brightest kids in their classes could not afford to go to college. Surely this problem had existed for a long time and in every high school in the United States, so we may wonder why the teachers of Joliet Township tried to change it in 1912. Perhaps it was because there were so many foreign-born immigrants in Joliet in 1912. Perhaps it was because many of these immigrant laborers with unpronounceable names were obsessed with the impossible dream of giving their children a college education. Or perhaps it was because many of the teachers of Joliet Township High School had made it the hard way during their own early years. In any case, a handful of high school teachers did question the validity of this fact in 1912 and came up with an idea that ran counter to the thinking of every authority in the educational establishment.

Obviously a handful of teachers could not make the "impossible dream" of a college education come true for all children in the United States, but perhaps they could give a few bright children a small taste of college by offering two or three college-level courses in the classrooms of Joliet Township High School. In 1912, this was a revolutionary idea. Surely it ran counter to the very idea of higher education in the United States. And certainly it ran counter to the thinking of the taxpayers of Joliet Township. So the authorities of the educational establishment—and some of the taxpayers—said flatly, "This idea is ridiculous. Everyone knows that the state is responsible for higher education, and surely this state provides many fine institutions for children who cannot afford to attend a private college or university." And some said, "It will cost too much." And others said, "The universities will never credit courses taught by high school teachers."

Fortunately for the children of the United States, one member of the local school board liked the idea, perhaps because he had made it the hard way during his own early years. So he persuaded the board that a few college-level classes would not cost much. Five college-level courses offered in the classrooms of a high school by five imaginative and concerned high school teachers—could this small effort have any lasting effect on the changing scene in education? Now, in 1970, there are hundreds of junior and community colleges, and the once "impossible dream" is within the reach of millions of people, both young and old.

All this happened because a few brave teachers dared to question a fact that had existed for a long time, because a few brave, imaginative, and concerned teachers cared enough to try to implement an idea that ran counter to the traditions of the educational establishment in their time. I am personally indebted to those revolutionary teachers, because they made the "impossible dream" come true for me.

Wallace Stevens put it this way:

Life consists
Of propositions about life. The human
Revery is a solitude in which
We compose these propositions, torn by dreams,
By the terrible incantations of defeats,
And by the fear that defeats and dreams are one.

The whole race is a poet that writes down
The eccentric propositions of its fate.

But I want to say it this way:

Educational theory consists of propositions about the processes of education. The ivory tower is a solitude in which educational theorists theorize endlessly about what is best for the children of the United States. But nothing really happens in education until one teacher puts one proposition to work in the life of one child—in one classroom, one gymnasium, on one playground. Nothing happens until one teacher—torn by dreams, by the terrible incantations of defeats, and by the fear that defeats and dreams are one—implements the propositions of the theorists, by trying to make those propositions work in the life on one child, 30 children, 80 children, in one classroom or in one gymnasium or playground.

Has anything happened in physical education during the past 50 years? Perhaps we should say 86 years, because our particular revolution really started in 1885. In that historic year, a motley array of doctors, professors, and administrators met together in the interests of physical education and founded the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, later known as the American Physical Education Association and eventually as AAHPER.

Briefly, this Association was born of a common belief in the efficacy of exercise. Every member of the Association believed that the children of the United States would benefit from regular periods of systematic exercise, conducted in the classroom or out-of-doors by a qualified teacher who knew something about the values of such exercise. In the fullness of that belief, our professional forefathers enunciated a new proposition, which ran counter to the thinking of the educational establishment of their time. They started a revolution within the establishment, a revolution still in process.

It got off to a slow start, partly because of the resistance within the establishment and partly because there was so much disagreement among our revolutionary ancestors. William Stecher and his allies believed that the German system of exercise was the best of all possible systems. Baron Nils Posse and his allies could not understand why anyone in his right mind would choose the German system over the scientifically validated Swedish system of exercise. And Dudley Allen Sargent and Edward Mussey Hartwell and their allies were searching for an American kind of physical education, which might be better suited to the needs of children living in the democratically oriented United States. So the early years of the Association were torn by internal disagreement, and the early literature of physical education is argumentative and often more emotional than rational.

Nonetheless, and despite this interminable infighting, our professional forefathers did get on with the job of persuading a few school districts to add some semblance of this new school subject to the established curriculum, usually without grades or credit. So a few teachers did, in fact, have a chance to make the idea of physical education happen in the lives of a few children.

During the next 30 years, as the old "authorities" gradually retired from the scene, a new crop of "authorities" took over—Luther Halsey Gulick, R. Tait McKenzie, Jessie Bancroft, and Lillian Curtis Drew, to name only a few. And every one of these newer authorities disagreed with Stecher, with Posse, with Sargent, in one way or another. And all of them disagreed with each other, in big ways or small.

Nonetheless the newer authorities did persuade a few more school districts and a few state legislatures of the desirability of adding some semblance of something called physical education to the school curriculum. So a few more teachers had a chance to make the idea of physical education happen in the lives of a few more children.

My own chance came in 1929, when a young teacher—with majors in mathematics and English and a one-unit course in "natural dance"—was hired to teach mathematics in a small community high school that served the educational needs of some 200 students. After I had signed my contract, the superintendent said casually, "By the way, you will also teach physical education, because the mathematics teacher always does." Then he told me not to worry about it, because the freshman girls had physical education only twice a week, and the upper-class girls could substitute "gym" for study hall if they wanted to, but only girls who liked basketball did this. So there would be only a few sophomores, juniors, and seniors, and they could help me teach the game to the freshmen. Then he said he thought nine months of basketball was a little too much, and he hoped I would give the girls some calisthenics along with their basketball. And if I wanted to take them outdoors for softball in the spring, that was all right with him.

That is really how it was in 1929, not only in one small community high school but in countless high schools across the country. One or two hours a week for freshmen—a lot of basketball, a little softball and mass volleyball for variety, with some calisthenic exercises thrown in for good measure—all taught by someone who could blow a whistle and maintain discipline.

Many high schools had less than that. Perhaps a boy's basketball team coached by the science teacher, maybe a track team, possibly a baseball team and a football team, and occasionally a girl's basketball team that played for "openers."

In 1929, I knew nothing about the literature of physical education, so I knew nothing about the arguments that had been going on for years. Nonetheless, in my untutored way, I did try to make the idea of physical education happen in the lives of 30 freshmen and about 50 upper-class girls who "signed out" of the study hall in order to play basketball and do calisthenic exercises every Monday and Wednesday afternoon. And perhaps you will let me say that, in my own way, I did a remarkably good job.

By 1929, a new crop of "authorities" was emerging within the Association—Jesse Feiring Williams, Jay B. Nash, C. H. McCloy, Agnes Wayman, Mabel Lee, and Rosalind Cassidy, to name only a few. Every one of these new authorities disagreed with their professional ancestors, because they thought they knew more about physical education than their ancestors did. And all of them disagreed with each other, in big ways and small, about their own interpretations of what physical education is all about.

Exercise? Basketball? Play and games? Folk dances? Physical fitness? Learning? Mental learning? Motor learning? Education? Education of the physical? Education through physical education? Moral and spiritual values? Character development? Social interaction? Teacher preparation? Majors, minors, and credentials? Advanced degrees in physical education? The authorities of the 30s, the 40s, and the 50s argued mightily about such matters. They were often divided against each other, and many teachers were confused by their differences. Nonetheless, the argumentative theorists of the 30s, the 40s, and the 50s did get on with the job of putting some kind of physical education into every school in the United States.

So the "impossible dream" of regular periods of physical education, taught by a qualified teacher, in every school in the United States moved a long way toward reality during these argumentative years. And in the gymnasiums and on the playgrounds of the schools of the United States, many well-qualified teachers, many poorly qualified teachers, and many confused teachers had a chance to put their own understanding of the debatable propositions of physical education to work in the lives of millions of children.

Now, in 1970, theorists in every area of education are wrestling with new propositions about the nature of human learning. And they are often sorely divided against each other, even as we are in physical education. In our own part of the ever-changing scene in education, some of our theorists are advocating a return to the propositions put forth by our forefathers in 1885. Others are persuaded that the propositions of 1930, as they understand them, said all that needs to be said about the values of physical education. And some of us are wrestling with the newer propositions of 1970, trying to find ways to put those propositions to work in the lives of millions of children who are now taking physical education for 12 to 14 years.

Recently, I had occasion to try to put my own understanding of some of these newer propositions together in a few short lines called "About Learning. . . ."

I sit in the classroom
  looking at what I see
  listening to what I hear
  sensing what I touch, taste, smell, and feel
  relating what I see and hear and sense and feel to
    what I know or think I know about
    what I know or think or feel about
    what I know or think or feel.

I move in the gymnasium, on the playground.

  Are my eyes blinded by movement?
  Are my ears silenced by play?
  Does action dull the sense of
    what I sense and feel and think?

Moving in the gymnasium, on the playground,
  I look at what I see
  I listen to what I hear
  I sense what I touch, taste, smell, and feel
  I relate what I see and hear and sense and feel to
    what I know or think I know about
    what I know or think or feel about
    what I know or think or feel.

This is how I learn in the classroom.
This is how I learn in the gymnasium, on the playground.

These lines make sense to many of the students who are now sitting in my classrooms and moving in my gymnasium, because this is how they experience the processes of learning in their own lives. But they are puzzled by my need to ask the questions:

Does action dull the senses?
Does play obliterate feeling and emotion?
Does the act of moving interfere with—or prevent—thought?

And so they ask me, do any educators—or physical educators—think that moving children leave their senses, their feelings, their emotions, and their thoughts in the classroom? Do any educational ''authorities'' think that the processes of action interfere with the processes of thought, feeling, and emotion? And they are amazed when I tell them that virtually all educators—and many physical educators—did entertain these ideas for many years. And many still do. Then they begin to understand why educators and physical educators are so often in disagreement with each other.

Sometimes they ask the questions that have troubled young and old teachers from time immemorial: What should teachers do when ''authorities'' disagree? What should teachers do when they disagree with the ''authorities''?

Then I may tell them an old story, which many of you have heard many times, for it is recorded in the 14th chapter of the Book of Matthew. But let me tell it in my own way.

You will remember that a great teacher was teaching in the desert, and 5,000 people were listening to his ideas, which ran counter to the thinking of most of the ''authorities'' of his time. And as the day wore on, the people grew hungry, and there was no food available in the desert. The men who were assisting the great teacher were concerned, and they wanted to do something. But as they looked into their own lunch baskets, they saw that they had only five loaves of bread and two small fishes, perhaps enough for themselves and one or two hungry children but surely not enough for 5,000 people. So they asked the great teacher, ''What shall we do?'' And the great teacher answered, ''offer them what you have.'' So the assistants broke the bread and fishes into many small pieces and offered them to the man who stood nearest to them. And as they did this, a wonderful thing began to happen. The first man said, ''I have a small loaf of bread hidden in the folds of my own garments, but I was reluctant to offer it to my companions, because it is such a small loaf and there are so many hungry people.'' Then he broke off a corner of the loaf for himself and tossed the rest into the basket. Then another man, and another, and another added a small loaf, a handful of figs, a dried fish, or a few dates. And lo, the 5,000 were fed, and there was enough left over to feed the children on their homeward journey.

Which propositions will you offer to the children in your classroom, your own gymnasium, your own place for physical education? In times of doubt and uncertainty, every teacher must be guided by his own understanding. So I say to you in the words of a great teacher: Offer them what you have. Offer them your own best understanding of the propositions of physical education. Offer them what you have, and—who knows—perhaps you, too, can make a miracle happen; perhaps you, too, can make an "impossible dream" *come true*.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE in the HPER LEADERS SPEAK series . . .

CONCEPTS AND CONVICTIONS

Del Oberteuffer, an eloquent spokesman throughout his many years of dedication to the achievement of excellence in both physical education and health education, speaks out again to the profession in this volume—sharing his thoughts and feelings on the education of the whole person, mind and body. This is a stimulating collection of articles by a renowned authority in both fields. "In no instance," he says in his preface, "did any audience or any class get less than my best." The contents of this book, recommended for all who are involved in health education and physical education, reflects that emphasis on excellence. 1977.

HPER OMNIBUS

A compilation of ideas, thoughts and beliefs of 16 recipients of the Luther Halsey Gulick Award—the highest honor accorded by AAHPER to its members. Transcribed from the original audiotapes developed as a part of the Alliance's "Tape the Leader" project, they include contributions by Ruth Abernathy, Dorothy S. Ainsworth, Rosalind Cassidy, Elwood Craig Davis, Margaret H'Doubler, Clair V. Langton, William Ralph LaPorte, Mabel Lee, Minnie L. Lynn, Helen Manley, Charles H. McCloy, Jay Bryan Nash, Neils P. Neilson, Julian W. Smith, Arthur H Steinhaus and Jesse Feiring Williams. 1976.

MEMORIES OF A BLOOMER GIRL

Mabel Lee, the "first lady of AAHPER," recounts her early life from the naughty nineties to the roaring twenties, reflecting the patterns of a growing country and an emerging profession—physical education. Bloomers became the symbol of the career she was to follow—beginning with sports and dance as a grade school girl, continuing into high school and college at the turn of the century, followed by two years of professional training, and finally a glimpse at her teaching career in the World War I era. Celeste Ulrich, in her foreword, calls it "a tender, compelling, emotional, revealing, awesome story." 1977.

TO SEEK AND FIND

An intimate look at AAHPER's 1976-77 president, Celeste Ulrich, through a selection of 15 of her speeches over the past decade. Telling it like it is—or should be—in HPER, she's one of the profession's most eloquent spokespersons. Sometimes controversial, always thought-provoking, these selections are must reading for every student and professional in HPER. 1976.

VITAL ISSUES

Here is a series of speeches by Eleanor Metheny, recognized for her contributions in "intellectualizing" the field of physical education. They span 30 eventful years for the profession—1942-1971. Considered controversial and provocative at that time, the speeches reflect the "mood" and trends that were prevalent during those years. Emphasis is on the "whole person" with particular reference to affective, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, symbolic and meaningful aspects of experiences related to physical education. 1977.

For order information and prices, write:

AAHPER Promotion Unit
1201 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036